

A Review of "Our Authorized Bible
Vindicated," by B. G. Wilkinson

ESR

Warren Eugene Howell

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS	4
Section I: A Survey of the General Features of the Volume	5
Violates Primal Laws of Evidence	6
Confuses Appreciation with Attack	9
Thrusts Odium Upon Users of A.R.V	11
Principles Governing the Translators	12
The Revival of a Century-Old Claim	16
The Argument Upon the "Itala"	19
Unfair and Untrustworthy Criticism	24
Misuse of Authorities	28
The Case of the Hexapla	34
Misquotation of Authorities	37
Conflict with the Spirit of Prophecy	39
Sister White's Use of the Revised Version	42
Bible Society Translations Not Confined to A.V	44
A Strangely Related Discovery	46
An Epitome of the Findings of This Section	48
Section II: On the Bible MSS in General	51
The Received Text	57
The Vaticanus Manuscript	65
Changes in the Authorized Version	72
MSS Available in 1611 and Now	74
Section III: Review of the Scripture Texts Cited in Chapters Six, Eleven and Twelve	77
CHAPTER VI. "Comparisons to Show How the Jesuit Bible Reappears in the ARV"	81
CHAPTER XI "Blow After Blow Against The Truth"	92
CHAPTER XII "Blow after Blow in Favor of Rome"	109
Summary on Scriptures Examined	122
Conclusion	129
General Summary	130

[CD-ROM Editor's Note: The author of this typewriter-written document is not listed, but it was prepared by a committee, with W. E. Howell as chairman, thus his name as author. Original paging was by Section. These pages numbers have been left in the text at their original locations, but running page numbers have been supplied throughout.]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section I: A Survey of the General Features of the Volume	1
Violates Primal Laws of Evidence	1
Confuses Appreciation with Attack	4
Thrusts Odium Upon Users of A.R.V	6
Principles Governing the Translators	7
The Revival of a Century-Old Claim	10
The Argument Upon the “Itala”	12
Unfair and Untrustworthy Criticism	17
Misuse of Authorities	21
The Case of the Hexapla	26
Misquotation of Authorities	28
Conflict with the Spirit of Prophecy	31
Sister White’s Use of the Revised Version	33
Bible Society Translations Not Confined to A.V	36
A Strangely Related Discovery	38
An Epitome of the Findings of This Section	40
Section II: On the Bible MSS in General	43
The Received Text	49
The Vaticanus Manuscript	54
Changes in the Authorized Version	59
MSS Available in 1611 and Now	60
Section III: Review of the Scripture Texts Cited in Chapters Six, Eleven and Twelve	63
CHAPTER VI. “Comparisons to Show How the Jesuit Bible Reappears in the ARV”	66
CHAPTER XI “Blow After Blow Against The Truth”	77
CHAPTER XII “Blow after Blow in Favor of Rome”	98
Summary on Scriptures Examined	111
Conclusion	119
General Summary	119

Section I: A Survey of the General Features of the Volume

Two vital facts immediately appear upon opening the volume to the title page. The first is the hidden identity of the printers, as there is no imprint of any publisher whatsoever. It is significant that the manuscript was neither submitted to nor published by any accredited Seventh-day Adventist publishing house. In other words, the authorization of the book itself is not vindicated as an approved denominational production. It was published in disregard of General Conference counsel, and over the plea of the executive officers that agitation of this question should cease.*RABV 1.1*

In immediate connection with this first fact—that of the unnamed publisher—is the inseparable second point that, despite the unauthorized character of this volume and the anonymity of the printer, the author seeks to fortify the standing and influence of his book by the use of his official title in a Seventh-day Adventist college, thus creating the impression that it represents the views of the denomination.*RABV 1.2*

Violates Primal Laws of Evidence

The opening statement at the head of Chapter I is an extract from a journal named “The Herald and Presbyter.” This journal is not listed in Ayer’s “Directory of Newspapers and Periodicals.” And according to official information “The Herald and Presbyter” is no longer published, but was several years ago merged with another independent weekly called “The Presbyterian.”*RABV 1.3*

This introductory citation of Chapter I leads logically into a brief word upon the principles governing evidence in a work of this character. There are just two possible approaches. One is to seek all the available facts from reliable sources, whatever and wherever they are, drawing an unbiased conclusion therefrom. The other is to first take a position and then to seek for supporting evidence, ignoring or discounting all contrary testimony. If one is insistent upon finding supporting evidence, some magazine or book will usually provide the desired expressions. Extreme and radical statements from individual members of such a diversified group as Fundamentalists can usually be obtained on almost any point. But such isolated presentations do not fairly represent the view of Fundamentalism at large, any more than this volume in review represents the attitude of our denominational leadership generally.*RABV 2.1*

The quotation in question asserts that the Revised Version is the Bible of the Modernists, and is part of the movement away from the faith once delivered. But let us inquire into the attitude of leading Fundamentalist exponents. In the current issues of the “Sunday School Times,”—the outstanding Fundamentalist journal of America,—the “International Uniform Lessons” are presented with the King James and the American Standard versions in parallel columns at the head of the lesson study. The position of this journal on the equal value of these versions is the same as the official position of Seventh-day Adventists, and of practically all other Protestant denominations.*RABV 2.2*

Further, the well-known Dr. James M. Gray, Dean of the Moody Bible Institute, and Editor of the “Moody Bible Institute Monthly,” whose standing in the front ranks of Fundamentalism is well

established, writing editorially in his journal, contributes this illuminating paragraph in response to an inquiry as to the reliability of the Revised Version:*RABV 3.1*

“Even an ordinary reader comparing these two versions, the King James and the Revised, can perceive that the changes though many, are comparatively unimportant. Sometimes an error in spelling has been corrected or a substitution has been made of one synonymous word for another, or a change of order in the wording of a phrase, but all this without any appreciable distinction of the sense. In other words, taking the changes altogether, they have not affected a single historical fact or essential doctrine of Christianity. And yet these scholars are said to have had in their hands for examination and comparison no less than 2,000 manuscripts of different books of the Old Testament and 3,000 manuscripts of different books of the New....*RABV 3.2*

“We now trust that we have satisfactorily answered the inquiry of our correspondent, and that he and our other readers may confidently believe that the sacred text in our hands in printer form is the eternal Word of God as He caused it to be written.”—“Moody Bible Institute Monthly, February. 1930. (Italics ours.)*RABV 3.3*

In a letter, dated January 20, 1931, accompanying a copy of the editorial, Dr. Gray adds, “I was unaware that Fundamentalists, as they are called, looked askance at the American Revised Version.”*RABV 3.4*

And Dr. Grant Stroh, the editor of one of the regular departments of that journal, writing officially for the Moody Bible Institute under date of Jan. 23, 1931 adds:*RABV 3.5*

“Here at the Institute we recommend the American Revision. We use both it and the Authorized. In most instances when changes are made the American Revision is the more accurate. we do not indorse the various irresponsible individual versions, such as the Moffat translation.”*RABV 3.6*

In instance after instance throughout the book the author violates the primal laws of evidence by taking statements out of their setting, and by the introduction of testimony of an extraneous nature, as will

be seen hereafter. There are many half-truths stated, and unwarranted impressions are thus left in the mind of the uninformed reader. These charges will be abundantly proven in the pages which follow. The removal and use of a brief statement from its context may conveniently serve a purpose, but it is an unsound and unscholarly procedure,—unless there be scrupulous and unbiased care exercised to see that it never violates the intent of the writer and the context of the excerpt.*RABV 3.7*

For example, the author quotes frequent and rather unfavorable comments from “A History of the Revised Version of the New Testament” by Samuel Hemphill. It seems but fair to state, however, that Mr. Hemphill’s book is an intimate record of the meetings of the Revision Committee in which he gives arguments and comments of its members, both favorable and unfavorable. The author of this book under review quotes often from Hemphill’s work, but confines himself to the unfavorable quotations. This does not fairly represent the general trend of Mr. Hemphill’s testimony.*RABV 4.1*

Confuses Appreciation with Attack

The author construes recognition or appreciation of the A.R.V. as an “attack” on the King James Version p. 74. The right of a competent minister to use the version of his choice in harmony with general denominational usage is thus challenged. It does not follow that use of the A.R.V. is “warfare” (p. 88) against the A.V. No one in this movement has for a moment thought of “throwing away” (p. 89) the King James Version. Those who appreciate the accuracy of the A.R.V. do not thereby depreciate the beauty and value of the A.V. No one contends that the A.R.V. is without imperfections, or that all changes made were for the best. There are certain unfortunate renderings in it, the same as in the A.V. There are instances wherein the personal views of the Revisers are doubtless reflected, the same as is patently observable in the A.V. But they both convey God’s authoritative message to men.*RABV 4.2*

It is manifestly most unwise to create the impression of hostility toward any standard version, as it might easily be regarded as an attack upon the very Word itself. In this skeptical age, when we are trying to revive faith in the Word of God and to lead as many as possible to accept its teachings and to render obedience thereunto at whatever cost, that our work should be made more difficult by this unnecessary issue is distressing indeed.*RABV 5.1*

The claims of this book place all users and preachers of the R. V. and A.R.V. under ban as pro-Roman, higher critical, or apostate. Moreover, aspersion is thus placed by the author upon the ministry and leadership of this movement because of the use of the R.V. and A.R.V., and upon Ellen G. White because of her free reading and published use of these two Versions, quoted hundreds of times in her later books as the authoritative Word of God. It is, of course, well known that our standard publications in English, since 1901, use the two versions with impartiality, and as equally authoritative.*RABV 5.2*

The comparison of the blemishes in the A.V. to the five scars on the resurrection body of Christ (pp. 180, 181) is a travesty upon our divine Sacrifice for sin. And the comparison of the Received Text to the star of Bethlehem (pp. 178, 179) borders perilously on

sacrilege!*RABV* 5.3

Thrusts Odium Upon Users of A.R.V

The significant question is asked, “Can we escape His (God’s) condemnation, if we choose to exalt any version containing proved corruptions?” (p. 250). The implication of divine disapproval is thus placed upon all who use the A.R.V. and this in spite of the fact that the A.V. contains imperfections according to the author’s own admission (p. 180). This condemnation must logically include Sister White, for she frequently used the Revised.*RABV 6.1*

Such a thrust places an intolerable odium upon anyone who desires to quote publicly from the A.R.V. A trustful laity, accepting such a premise largely on the basis of confidence in the minister presenting it, is led to look askance at anyone who might desire to use the Revised. Our laity should be protected from such imposition.*RABV 6.2*

The contention is made by the author in numerous places that the renderings of the A.R.V. distort or destroy the force of certain of our cherished fundamental doctrines. But the allegation collapses under the simple fact that many of our most effective and fruitful preachers and teachers use the A.R.V. to present those very truths forcefully and effectually, and neither preacher nor hearer finds any difficulty in coming to identical conclusions with the users of the King James.*RABV 6.3*

Where the contention of the book is accepted, it must obviously become the arbitrary test of a man’s “orthodoxy” and spiritual discernment, and consequently of his fitness to minister or to administer—and all in contravention to the clear operating principles of our highest executive body, and of our general denominational practice. The principle is far-reaching. Where this premise is received it becomes a determining factor in the selection of men for responsibility in ministerial lines. But a leader who makes this the test of acceptability thereby attempts to establish a test that is not accepted by this people. Such a platform would split our forces into two camps at the very time when unity is imperative in meeting a hostile world, as well as the onslaughts of apostate enemies.*RABV 6.4*

Principles Governing the Translators

The determining principles governing the work of the King James and the Revision committees are definitely discerned and stated, by the author, but not observed by him in his criticisms. On page 175 the contention is made that “even the jots and tittles of the Bible are important,” yet the very principle of “exact and literal translation” (p. 170), was admittedly the basis of R.V. translations, whereas, he declares that the principle followed, by the 1611 body was that the Greek text should be “translated freely” (p. 109). In full, the passage reads: “The Reformers said that the Greek of the New Testament was cast in Hebrew forms of thought, and translated freely; the Revisers literally. The Revisers followed Winer. We see the results of their decision in the Revised New Testament” (p. 109). Just what these results are, as between the literal and the free, will be seen in detail in Section III.*RABV 7.1*

The implication is made that every change by the Revisers is a corruption per se, and the author dwells upon the number of “changes” —nearly 36,000 in all (p. 175). But when the truth is known, the vast majority of these are seen to be simply minor, technical, verbal improvements for greater accuracy, such as in spelling, punctuation, order of words in the sentence, uniformity in translating the same Hebrew and Greek words, modern use of the personal pronouns “who” and “that” in place of “which,” the insertion and omission of the definite article with proper names, and recognition of the different meanings of the same English word as between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. These account for the overwhelming majority of the “changes.”*RABV 7.2*

Two extracts are here submitted which are typical of the attitude of hosts of outstanding conservative Fundamentalist scholars upon this point, and additional evidence is given in Section II, p. 4. We quote first from the scholarly Dr. James Orr:*RABV 8.1*

“As respects results, it may be said generally that the labors of a long line of scholars have given us a NT text on which, in nearly all essential respects, we can safely rely. Others, it is to be owned, take a less sanguine view (of Nestle, op. cit., 227 ff). The correct reading seems undeniably settled in a large majority of cases. The

RV embodies most of the assured results; doubtful cases are noted in the margin.”—“The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia,” Vol. 2, p. 751.*RABV 8.2*

And again, a bit more fully from Dr. James M. Gray, on the English and American revisions:*RABV 8.3*

“Those English, divines Westcott and Hort are considered by many scholars as the highest and latest authority on the Greek text. Also they belong to a school which has always made the most of any has tile argument which various readings were supposed to afford. Nevertheless, they assure us that the proportion of words in our present Greek text which are raised above doubt is about seven-eighths of the whole, and that the remaining one-eighth consists merely of changes in the order of words and. other ‘trivialities,’ as they express it. To quote their exact language, ‘the amount of what can in any sense be called substantial variation can hardly form more than a thousandth part of the entire text.’ That is, as Dr. John Urquhart says, ‘the comparison of the manuscripts assures us that every 999 words are absolutely the words placed on record by the sacred penman, and that there is doubt only upon one word in every thousand.’”—Moody Bible Institute Monthly, February, 1930.*RABV 8.4*

The fact that the overwhelming proportion of the two texts is identical, destroys the ponderously constructed argument about unbridgeable divergence. These “changes” are but minor deviations of one identical Bible.*RABV 9.1*

“Two Parallel Streams of Bibles” (p. 43), arbitrarily created by the author, are formed for a purpose, and do not rest upon historical authority. The Revisers did not confine themselves to one manuscript group, but consulted Western, Antiochian, Neutral, and Alexandrian manuscripts.*RABV 9.2*

The author condemns both Testaments of the American Revised Version, but virtually confines his criticisms to the New Testament. Yet the changes for greater accuracy in the Old Testament are even, in some respects, more marked than the changes in the New Testament. This is acknowledged by one historian of the Revision, before noted, who declares, “The attention of scholars and of the

general public naturally shifted to the earlier and larger portion, of the Sacred Volume [the Old Testament], the merits of whose Revised Version soon won universal admiration.”—“A History of the Revised Version of the New Testament,” by Samuel Hemphill, D. D., Litt. D., p. 125.*RABV 9.3*

And now observe the words of the learned Dr. Kenyon, Librarian of the British Museum, relative to the reasons for some of the verbal changes:*RABV 9.4*

“What, then, were the causes which led to the revision of this beloved version [the Authorized] within the present generation, after it had held its ground for nearly three hundred years? They may be summed up in a single sentence: The increase of our knowledge concerning the original Hebrew and Greek texts, especially the latter.... The translators [of 1611] used, the best materials that they had to their hands, and with good results, since their texts were substantially true, though not in detail; but since their time the materials have increased enormously. New manuscripts have come to light, and all the earliest copies have been minutely examined and discussed. Many scholars have devoted years of their lives to the collection of evidence bearing on the text of the New Testament; and the general result of these generations of study is to show that the text used by the translators of 1611 is far from perfect.”—“Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts,” F. G. Kenyon, pp. 236, 237.*RABV 9.5*

“The first class of changes introduced in the Revised Version consists of those which are due to a difference in the text translated; and these are most conspicuous and most important in the New Testament. The version of 1611 was made from a Greek text formed by a comparison of very few manuscripts, and those, for the most part, late. The version of 1881, on the other hand, was made from a Greek text based upon an exhaustive examination, extending over some two centuries, of all the best manuscripts in existence. In Dr. Hort and Dr. Scrivener the New Testament company possessed the two most learned textual critics then alive; and when it is remembered that no change was finally accepted unless it had the support of two-thirds of those present, it will be seen that the Greek text underlying the Revised Version has very

strong claims on our acceptance.”— Ibid., pp. 238, 239.*RABV 10.1*

The Revival of a Century-Old Claim

The author's definite objective to establish the superiority of the Textus Receptus over the texts used by the translators of the Revised Version constitutes one of the main contentions of his book. This is shown by the following extract taken from the chapter entitled "The Bible Adopted by Constantine and the Pure Bible of the Waldenses," pages 23-24:*RABV 10.2*

"This chapter will show that the Textus Receptus was the Bible in possession and use in the Greek Empire, in the countries of Syrian Christianity, in northern Italy, in southern France, and in the British Isles in the second century. This was a full century and more before the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus saw the light of day. When the apostles of the Roman Catholic Church entered these countries in later centuries they found the people using the Textus Receptus; and it was not without difficulty and a struggle that they were able to displace it and to substitute their Latin Vulgate. This chapter will likewise show that the Textus Receptus belongs to the type of these early apostolic manuscripts that were brought from Judea, and its claim to priority over the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus will be established."*RABV 10.3*

It is decidedly informative to discover that this contention of the author is simply the revival of an effort made more than a hundred years ago to establish this same claim. A book was printed in 1815 (the author being "The Rev. Frederick Nolan, a Presbyter of the United Church"), with the title, "An Inquiry Into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, or Received Text of the New Testament; in Which the Greek Manuscripts are Newly Classed, the Integrity of the Authorized Text Vindicated, and the Various Readings Traced to Their Origin."*RABV 11.1*

In passing, it may be remarked that the striking similarity in objective, between the two books of 1930 and a century previous, as well as the very expression on the title page of the 1815 volume,—"The Authorized Text Vindicated,"—is to say the least a singular coincidence.*RABV 11.2*

This work by Mr. Nolan is lauded by the author on pages 40 and 41,

and is again referred to on pages 42 and 49. Great confidence is reposed by the author in Mr. Nolan's contentions, and he says, relative to the conviction of his precursor:*RABV 11.3*

"He felt certain that researches in this direction would demonstrate that the Italic New Testament, or the New Testament of those primitive Christians of northern Italy whose lineal descendants the Waldenses were, would turn out to be the Received Text." (p. 40.)*RABV 11.4*

Mr. Nolan's own claim is clearly set forth in a summary of his views in the following quotation:*RABV 11.5*

"In fine, a very short process enables us to prove, that the tradition which supports the authority of this text the Textus Receptus has continued unbroken since the age of the apostles. The coincidence of the Vulgar (Common) Greek of our present editions with the old Italic translation, enables us to carry up the tradition to the times of St. Jerome. The testimony of this learned father enables us to extend the proof beyond this period, to the times of Lucianus, in whose age the Byzantine text equally constituted the Vulgate or common edition. And the character of Lucianus, and the course which he pursued in revising the sacred text, connects this proof with the times of the inspired writers, who could alone impress that authority upon one text, which, by bringing it into general use, rendered it, from the primitive ages down to the present day, the Greek characters here or Greek Vulgate."—"An Inquiry Into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate," pp. 126, 127.*RABV 12.1*

It is a significant fact that the labored effort of Mr. Nolan, characterized by frequent and easily assumed conclusions to establish his main contention, was strongly and effectually contradicted by scholars of his time, and that it made so little impression upon the history of the Bible that it is scarcely referred to in recent times by the recognized scholars who have dealt with this subject. It may be well which to add here that the Nolan volume which was printed sixteen years before Lachmann, followed by an illustrious line of textual investigators, had ventured into the hitherto largely neglected field of the study of Greek manuscripts of the New Testament with the purpose of establishing a text based upon

original authorities.*RABV 12.2*

The Argument Upon the “Itala”

One of the arguments used by the author to establish his claim of transmission of the pure apostolic text by the early Christians of northern Italy is this:*RABV 12.3*

“It is held that the pre-Waldensian Christians of northern Italy could not have had doctrines purer than Rome unless their Bible was purer than Rome’s; that is, was not of Rome’s falsified manuscripts.”—Page 31.*RABV 12.4*

The utter unsoundness of this argument will readily appear when we apply it to our own movement. According to this view, it would be impossible for us to hold any purer view concerning Christian doctrine than that which is held by the other churches unless we had a purer Bible than they. But we use identically the same Bibles, whether King James or Revised. And it is a great satisfaction to take the very Bibles in the hands of the other denominations and from them establish our distinctive doctrines. Not only so, but the very prophecies which we use to establish our claims concerning the apostasy of the Roman Catholic Church are found in the officially authorized Catholic text. The contention utterly collapses in the light of Luther’s experience, and of every marked spiritual advance or reform through the centuries.*RABV 12.5*

The basis of the argument that the pre-Waldensian Christians had a purer Bible in their possession is the repeated contention that their text known as the Italic or Itala, was transmitted in a pure form direct from Palestine to them. (Pages 23-43.) This assertion seems to make necessary the submission of documentary evidence concerning this manuscript and its origin, even though it be a bit technical.*RABV 13.1*

The uncertainty in his own contention is clearly recognized even by Mr. Nolan in these words: “Notwithstanding the labors of M. M. Bianchini and Sabatier, much remains to be done with this version [the Itala] the history of which is so little known that the very propriety of its name has been questioned.”—Preface, p. xvii.*RABV 13.2*

The decisive consideration is whether the Itala was transmitted direct from Palestine, or whether it originated in north Africa.*RABV 13.3*

Let us note the following testimony:*RABV 14.1*

Latin Version Traced to Africa :—"It is then to Africa that we must look for the first traces of the Latin 'Peshito', the 'simple' version of the West."—"A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament During the First Four Centuries," by B. F. Westcott, p. 272.*RABV 14.2*

The same writer then deals with the question of the various Latin versions thus:*RABV 14.3*

No Independent Latin Versions :—"Even if it be proved that new Latin versions, which agree more or less exactly with the African version, were made in Italy, Spain and Gaul, as the congregations of Latin Christians increased in number and importance; that fact proves nothing against the existence of an African original. For if we call these various versions 'new,' we must limit the force of the word to a fresh revision and not to an independent translation of the whole. There is not the slightest trace of the existence of independent Latin versions; and the statements of Augustine are fully satisfied by supposing a series of ecclesiastical recensions [revisions] of one fundamental text which were in turn reproduced with variations and corrections in private MSS. In this way there might well be said to be 'an infinite variety of Latin interpreters' while a particular recension [revision] like the 'Itala' could be selected for general commendation."— Ibid, pp. 277, 278. (Italics ours.)*RABV 14.4*

The learned Dr. Swete adds the results of his exhaustive study and research in this testimony:*RABV 14.5*

Daughter-Version of the Septuagint :—"To the church of north Africa, on the other hand, the Greek Bible was a sealed book; for Carthage, colonized from Rome before the capital had been flooded by Greek residents, retained the Latin tongue as the language of common life. It was at Carthage, probably, that the earliest daughter-version of the Septuagint, the Old Latin Bible, first saw the

light; certainly it is there that the oldest form of the Old Latin Bible first meets us in the writings of Cyprian.”—“An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek,” by Henry Barclay Swete, D. D., p. 88.*RABV 14.6*

The following quotation from an authority favorably quoted by the author, indicates the close relationship between the Italian family of texts and Jerome’s Vulgate, an attempt made in the fourth century to establish an authorized Latin text:*RABV 14.7*

Itala a Stepping Stone to Vulgate :—“The Italian family of Bible MSS. presents us with a type of text mainly European, but doubly revised; first in its renderings ‘to give the Latinity a smoother and more customary aspect,’ and secondly in its underlying text, which has been largely corrected from the Greek; in both these points the Italian MSS. are a sort of stepping stone between the European MSS. and Jerome’s Vulgate; and as many of the Biblical quotations in Augustine’s works agree closely with them, it is distinctly probable that it was this revision which he praised as the Itala.”—“A plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament,” Frederick Henry Ambrose Scrivener, Vol. II, pp. 55, 56.*RABV 15.1*

Again on page 35, the author uses a quotation from “The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,” dealing with the Itala translation, but neglects to take cognizance of an append footnote which says, “The translation here referred to is the Vetus Latina as revised by the church of northern Italy in the fourth century, prior to the final recension of Jerome, commonly called the Vulgate.” (“The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,” edited by Philip Schaff, Vol. II, on Christian Doctrine, Book II, chapter 15.) This note makes it clear that the Itala was not an independent text transmitted directly from Palestine, but was a revision of the Old Latin text originating in north Africa and leading up to the Vulgate.*RABV 15.2*

Further evidence from Dr. Gregory, as to the origin of the Itala translation is found in the following extract:*RABV 15.3*

Itala Derived From Africa :—“The Old Latin translation arose probably in North Africa. Rome and Southern Italy in Christian circles were too thoroughly Greek at first to need a Latin text. It appears to have been used, for example, by the translator of

Irenaeus.”—” Canon and Text of the New Testament,” Casper Rene Gregory, p. 156.*RABV 15.4*

Additional information, together with a suggestion that the Italic may be identical with the Vulgate of Jerome, is next presented:*RABV 16.1*

Itala Be Identical With Vulgate:—“When we come down to the 4th cent. we find in Western Europe, and esp. in North Italy, a second type of text, which is designated. European, the precise relation of which to the African has not been clearly ascertained. Is this an independent text which has arisen on the soil of Italy, or is it a text derived by alteration and revision of the African as it traveled northward and westward? ... A technical listing of various MSS. with the official designation follows.... Still later, Professor Hort says from the middle of the 4th cent., a third type, called Italic from its more restricted range, is found. It is represented by Codex Brixianus (f) of the 6th cent., now at Brescia, and Codex Monacensis (q) of the 7th cent., at Munich This text is probably a modified form of the European, produced by revision which has brought it more into accord with the Greek, and has given it a smoother Let in aspect. The group has received this name because the text found in many of Augustine’s writings is the same, and as he expressed a preference for the Itala, the group was designated accordingly. Recent investigation tends to show that we must be careful how we use Augustine as an Old Latin authority, and that the Itala may be, not a pre-Vulgate text, but rather Jerome’s Vulgate. This, however, is still uncertain.”—T. Nichol, in “The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, James Orr. M.A., D.D., General Editor, Vol. III, pp. 1842-1843.*RABV 16.2*

Another authority, writing on the Scriptures of the Waldenses, states:*RABV 16.3*

Waldenses Had Only Vulgate :—“The Waldenses of the middle ages were acquainted and could be acquainted with the Vulgate only, as it was generally received in their time; it is even very doubtful whether they had a complete version of it. But of the four supposed Waldensian manuscripts of the New Testament, there are two which also contain Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus.”—History of

the Canon of the Holy Scriptures in the Christian Church,” Edward Reuss, Professor in the University of Strassburg, p. 264 *RABV 16.4*

The claim of the author is that the Waldenses had a pure text of the Bible, transmitted direct to them from Palestine, and that this text was the foundation of the Textus Receptus. But the testimony here submitted shows that the Waldensian Bible was in all likelihood a revision of the Old Latin text originating in northern Africa, and that it was doubtless the last revision of the Old Latin text previous to, and leading up to, the Vulgate edited by Jerome, And some even believe that it was identical with the Vulgate, and. that the Bible of the Waldenses was the Vulgate itself. Therefore the effort to establish the claim that the Waldensian Church possessed manuscripts directly descended from the apostolic originals, collapses. Neither Mr. Nolan in 1815, nor the author of the book under review in 1930, is able to convince any textual critic that this claim is a sound one. But when this claim is overthrown the very foundation of the book under review is removed, and the conclusions which are based upon it are rendered untenable. *RABV 16.5*

Unfair and Untrustworthy Criticism

The chapter on “Westcott and Hort” is a manifest appeal to religious prejudice, and, an argumentum ad hominem, both unworthy of a fair, Christian scholar. The reference to Hort’s “anti Americanism” is wholly beside the point, having nothing to do with his textual criticism as an exacting scholar. The strained quotations alleged to prove Westcott’s spiritualistic tendencies, and his and Hort’s personal views on evolution are subjected to an unfair deduction as to their qualifying as experts in textual criticism. On counts like these, we might be compelled to reject the majority of the eight hundred translations of the Scriptures, or portions, into modern foreign languages, upon which our missionaries depend so continuously for the prosecution of their committed task.*RABV 17.1*

In the chapter “Blow After Blow Against the Truth,” there is a succession of charges to the effect that fundamental doctrines are changed in the Revised renderings on the basis of personal beliefs on the part of the revisers. But it is not a question of the theology of the men, but of What did the original Greek text say? If there is manifest honesty and fidelity in seeking to establish an authenticated text, the argument on the theology of the translators collapses. None of the translators of either 1611, 1881, or 1901 understood the intent of *Revelation 14*, the sanctuary truth, or the prophecies in general. All were Sunday keepers and believers in natural immortality. But that did not invalidate the work they did as translators of the Bible.*RABV 18.1*

If, however, some of the personal views of the committee of 1611 were disclosed, what a contrast might appear to the extravagant eulogium of the members of this committee by the author! But if the personal beliefs of the translators invalidate their labors, then verily we are indeed in a hard way, for men of every persuasion—Fundamentalists, Modernists, conservatives, liberals, ritualists, evangelicals, evolutionists, creationists, sprinklers, immersionists—have all engaged in the work of translation.*RABV 18.2*

The author appears to have undertaken his work on the basis that if he can discredit the work of Westcott and Hort he has effectually discredited the Revised Version. On this basis he attempts to show

them as really Roman Catholic in their belief. In view of these facts, it is enlightening to note that Scrivener, who is recognized by the author as an outstanding scholar, and who in general opposed the textual criticism of Westcott and Hart, testifies that the influence of these men over the text adopted by the Revisionists was "by no means a preponderating one."—"Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament," fourth edition, Vol. II, page 284, note. And the author does not tell us that the great Scrivener, whom he so often quotes, came to see before he died that the Received Text could not be supported unconditionally as he once thought.—Caspar René Gregory, "Canon and Text of the New Testament," p. 462, Scribner's, 1907.*RABV 18.3*

The scholarly Dr. Hemphill, before mentioned at some length, refers to Scrivener's attitude toward the manuscripts used by the Revision Committee, especially the Vatican and Sinaitic, in these strong terms:*RABV 19.1*

"Not that Scrivener was prepared to give an unqualified support to the traditional text, or blind to the value of the great Vatican and Sinaitic Manuscripts. Indeed no one who has read his Introduction much less his Collation of the Sinaitic Manuscript, can make so silly an assertion."—"A History of the Revised Version of the New Testament," by Samuel Hemphill, D. D., Litt. D., p. 55.*RABV 19.2*

The author's aspersions on these two ancient manuscripts would seem to be thus catalogued as "silly."*RABV 19.3*

Matthew Brown Riddle, D. D., LL. D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis at Theological Seminary, Hartford, and later of Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny, Pa., was a member of the American Revision Committee and was one of the three who actually acted as editors of the A.R.V. New Testament. He has made available the intimate story of the Committee's work, and has disclosed the principles that were operative. Surely he is qualified to speak, and he writes:*RABV 19.4*

"A copy [of Westcott and Hort's Greek Testament] sent to America was entrusted to the present writer, who collated the readings and added notices of them to the footnotes in Scrivener's edition. It was evident that the readings accepted by the English Revisers were

quite as frequently those of Tregelles as those of Westcott and Hort. In the American Company the readings were carefully discussed. While in the vast majority of cases the preferences of the English Revisers were approved, this was due to independent judgment. Dr. Ezra Abbot was the foremost textual critic in America, and his opinion usually prevailed when questions of text were debated. It may be said that neither he nor any other member of the Company endorsed the peculiar theory of Westcott and Hort, in regard to what they call the 'Neutral' text, a theory which gives to the Codex Vaticanus (designated B) preponderating authority. So also the obvious partiality of Tischendorf for the readings of the Codex Sinaiticus (designated Aleph), which he had discovered, was carefully guarded against."—"The Story of the Revised New Testament," pp. 30, 31.*RABV 20.1*

Since the author also quotes quite extensively from "The Revision Revised," by John William Burgon, Dean of Chichester, it may be in place to give an unbiased estimate of Burgon's work as presented by Mr. Hemphill:*RABV 20.2*

"October 1881 contributed some remarkable criticisms. Foremost among these was the opening article in the Quarterly Review by John William Burgon, Dean of Chichester. Its style was regrettable, while its learning was profound. In this and the two succeeding numbers of the Review, Burgon wounded the Revisers deeply, spoke of them as if they had been almost imbeciles, and gave them no credit for any of the improvements which they had made. A less stinging style and a little fairness would have been more effective in the long run. As a specimen of controversial invective, this series of articles (since republished under the name of The Revision Revised) is unsurpassed; but they had the immediate and unfortunate result of casting other less amusing but more edifying criticisms too much into the shade, and of making it appear that all opposition to the new Revision proceeded from sheer undiluted prejudice."—Idem., p. 101.*RABV 20.3*

Of the bitterness of Burgon, Kenyon says:*RABV 20.4*

"Dean Burgon tilted desperately against the text of Westcott and Hort, and even went so far as to argue that these two documents

[Aleph and B] owed their preservation, not to the goodness of their text, but to its depravity, having been, so to speak, pilloried as examples of what a copy of the Scriptures ought not to be! In spite of the learning with which the Dean maintained his arguments, and of the support which equally eminent but more moderate scholars such as Dr. Scrivener gave to his conclusions, they have failed to hold their ground. Scholars in general believe B [the Vatican Manuscript] to be the chief evidence for the most ancient form of the New Testament text, and it is clear that the Revisers of our English Bible attached the greatest weight to its authority.”—” Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts,” F. G. Kenyon, p. 133.*RABV 20.5*

Misuse of Authorities

The author has engaged in wide research, but it has been undertaken with a distinct bias. And that very feature makes the unreliable character of the work the more deplorable for, building upon some of those grounds of common knowledge and consent, the author leads on relentlessly to his specious and unwarranted positions regarding the A.R.V.*RABV 21.1*

The author has apparently prejudged his case before looking for his testimony. To illustrate: On pages 20-22 there are repeated implications to the effect that the Vatican (Codex B) and the Sinaiticus (Codex Aleph) manuscripts are two of fifty manuscripts prepared by Eusebius for the Emperor Constantine. But the following from Charles Fremont Sitterly, in the conservative "International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia," Vol. 5, p. 2952, bears neutralizing testimony:*RABV 21.2*

"The theory of Tischendorf that Codices Aleph [the Sinaitic Manuscript] and B [the Vatican Manuscript] were in part prepared by the same hand and that they were both among the 50 MSS made under the direction of Eusebius at Caesarea in 331 for use in the emperor Constantine's new capital, is not now generally accepted."*RABV 21.3*

Four typical examples of untrustworthy manipulation will suffice. On page 170 the author says: "The new Greek Testament upon which Westcott and Hort had been working for twenty years was, portion by portion, secretly committed into the hands of the Revision Committee. Their Greek Text was strongly radical and revolutionary, 36" (Italics ours.) The footnote reference reads, "30 Dr. Salmon, *Some Criticism*, pp. 11, 12." There is no mistaking the implication given here. But when one turns to the volume cited but not quoted in the footnote, and reads the actual words of Salmon, it appears that the expression "strongly radical and revolutionary" has been wrongly applied. Salmon, be it remembered, was a critic of Westcott and Hort, yet in this citation pays remarkable tribute to their trustworthy scholarship and conservatism, and states that their "radical and revolutionary" attitude was in increased carefulness and conservatism as compared with Lachmann who had preceded

them. We quote in full:*RABV 21.4*

“If the leaders of the Cambridge school [Westcott and Hort] deserved the gratitude of Churchmen who knew them only by their published works, much more was due to them from those who came within the range of their personal influence. By their honesty, sincerity, piety, zeal, and the absence of all self-seeking, they gained the love as well as the admiration of successive generations of students; and it is hard to say whether they benefited the Church more by their own works or by the learned scholars whom they trained, and who possibly may still outdo the performance of their masters. Surely these were men to whom the most timidly conservative of theologians might have trusted the work of textual revision in full confidence that its results would be such as they could gladly accent. So it was all the more surprising when these critics, who, with regard to the authority of the books, belong to the conservative school, proved to be, in respect of the criticism of the text, strongly radical and revolutionary. Authorities which Lachmann had admitted into his scanty list were depressed to an inferior place; readings which Tischendorf had received into his text were bracketed or removed, altogether. Possibly it may be found on investigation that the strict orthodoxy of the Revisers had something to do with the stringency of their conditions for admission into their text.”—“Some Criticisms of the Text of the New Testament,” by George Salmon, D. D., pp. 10, 11. (Italics ours.)*RABV 22.1*

And as to expressions in the same citation, concerning Westcott and Hort’s Greek Testament being “portion by portion, secretly committed into the hands of the Revision Committee,” the same Dr. Salmon, in the same chapter, says:

“The company of the New Testament Revisers were indeed privately supplied with installments of Westcott and Hort’s Greek text as their work required them. But that text did not come into the hands of the public until a little after the appearance of the Revised English Testament.”—Page 15. (Italics ours.)*RABV 23.1*

Surely there is a manifest difference between privately supplying as needed, and secretly committing, which implies a studied attempt to operate along questionable lines. Thus the obvious intent of Salmon is basically different from the construction placed upon the

expression used in the book under review.*RABV 23.2*

Another typical illustration will be found upon page 183. In this chapter, “Blow After Blow Against the Truth,” the opening statement reads: “There are many who claim that the changes in the Revised Version did not affect any doctrine. Bishop Westcott reveals the contrary. His utterances prove that the Revisers worked systematically during the ten years of their task to make alterations that by a repetition of details they might alter articles of faith. This we have shown in the previous chapter. 1” The footnote reads,” 1 Westcott, *Some Lessons*, p. 184. “But upon actually turning to Westcott, the meaning and intent of the “repetition of details” is placed before us in the Bishop’s own words, and it proves to be quite different from that which the author of the book under review implies. Again we quote:*RABV 23.3*

“The illustrations of the work of Revision, hitherto given, have been taken for the most part from isolated words and phrases. Such changes as have been noticed unquestionably increase the vividness and force of the version. They enable the English reader to weigh the significance of identity and differences in the parallel passages of the New Testament with a confidence which was before impossible. But the value of the Revision is most clearly seen when the student considers together a considerable group of passages, which bear upon some article of the Faith. The accumulation of small details then produces its full effect. Points on which it might have seemed pedantic to insist in a single passage become impressive by repetition.”—” *Some Lessons of the Revised Version of the New Testament*,” by Brooke Foss Westcott, D. D., D. C. L., pp. 184, 185.*RABV 23.4*

Surely there is a fundamental difference between a deliberate attempt to alter articles of faith, as alleged, and the full effect of repetition that strengthens and supports faith.*RABV 24.1*

Yet another example of misuse of authorities,—by reference to then as the basis of statements made in the text, without directly quoting the authority,—is found on page 248, where the author says, “The spirit of the Revisionists on both sides of the ocean was an effort to find the word of God by the study of comparative religions.” As

authority for such a statement, reference is made to “The Person of Our Lord,” by G. F. Nolloth, page 3. But the following is the statement made by Mr. Nolloth:*RABV 24.2*

“In the process of readjustment which is now in progress, a different course is being pursued. The Christian religion is being subjected to an examination based, roughly speaking, on two factors. One is the comparative study of religions. The other is the critical study of the original Christian documents.”*RABV 24.3*

The author of “The Person of Our Lord” makes absolutely no reference to the Revisionists or their work, and it is a perverted use of authority to cite him in support of the charge made by the author.*RABV 24.4*

Still another glaring exhibition is to be found on page 21 where we read: “The following quotation is given as evidence that the Sinaitic Manuscript was the work of Origen.” The quotation as found in the author’s text reads thus:*RABV 24.5*

“It [Sinaitic MS.] seems to have been at one time at Caesarea; one of the correctors (probably of seventh century) adds this note at the end of Esdras [Ezra]: ‘This Codex was compared with a very ancient exemplar which had been corrected by the hand of the holy martyr Pamphilus (d.309); which exemplar contained at the end, the subscription in his own hand: “Taken and corrected according to the Hexapla of Origen: Antonius compared it: I, Pamphilus, corrected it”.... The text of Aleph bears a very close resemblance to that of B.”*RABV 25.1*

The reference given is, “Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. IV, p. 86.”*RABV 25.2*

The whole paragraph from which this extract is made follows. And pertinent comment upon the three lines underscored will bring out three significant facts.*RABV 25.3*

“In age this manuscript ranks alongside the Codex Vaticanus. Its antiquity is shown by the writing, by the four columns to a page (an indication, probably, of the transition from the roll to the codex form of MS.), by the absence of the large initial letters and of ornaments,

by the rarity of punctuation, by the short titles of the books, the presence of divisions of the text antedating Eusebius, the addition of Barnabas and Hermas, etc. Such indications have induced experts to place it in the fourth century, along with B and some time before A and C; this conclusion is not seriously questioned, though the possibility of an early fifth-century date is conceded. Its origin has been assigned to Rome, Southern Italy, Egypt, and Caesarea, but cannot be determined (Kenyon, *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the N. T.*, London, 1901, p. 56 sqq.) It seems to have been at one time at Caesarea; one of the correctors (probably of seventh century) adds this note at the end of Esdras: 'This codex was compared with a very ancient exemplar which had been corrected by the hand of the holy martyr Pamphilus d. 309; which exemplar contained at the end the subscription in his own hand: "Taken and corrected according to the Hexapla of Origen: Antonius compared it: I, Pamphilus, corrected it."' Pamphilus was, with Eusebius, the founder of the library at Caesarea. Some are even inclined to regard Aleph as one of the fifty MSS. which Constantine bade Eusebius of Caesarea to have prepared in 331 for the churches of Constantinople; but there is no sign of its having been at Constantinople. Nothing is known of its later history till its discovery by Tischendorf. The text of Aleph bears a very close resemblance to that of B, though it cannot be descended from the same immediate ancestor. In general, B is placed first in point of purity by contemporary scholars and Aleph next. This is especially true, for the N. T., of the Gospels. The differences are more frequent in the O. T. where Aleph and A often agree." *RABV 25.4*

A comparison of the extract used by the author with the original paragraph in full shows (1) that if the author had begun his quotation with the beginning of the paragraph his claim would have been nullified, since it says that the origin of the Sinaitic MSS. "cannot be determined;" (2) if the author had retained in his extract that portion which he omitted, his claim would again have been invalidated, since in dealing with the question of whether the Sinaitic MS. was one of the fifty manuscripts made by Eusebius for Constantine it says, "There is no sign of its having been at Constantinople;" and (3) it will be observed by comparison of these paragraphs that the author closes his extract in the middle of the sentence, evidently because if he had quoted the whole sentence it

would again have nullified his claim, for the omitted part reads, "it cannot be descended from the same ancestor." Thus the author, in dealing with this paragraph for the purpose of establishing his claim, has perverted it in a threefold manner by omitting those portions of the paragraph which would absolutely disprove his claim.*RABV*
25.5

The Case of the Hexapla

It should be observed in this connection that the author carefully avoids the expression “New Testament” throughout the pages of this section (pages 19-22), studiously employing the term “Bible.” This is significant, for the New Testament was not a part of the Hexapla. Yet the author seems content to let the impression prevail that the Hexapla of Origen,—which he is discussing, in its influence upon MSS. “B” and “Aleph,”—contained both the New and Old Testaments, while as a matter of truth it was confined to the Old Testament, as the following authorities, both Protestant and Catholic, assert:*RABV 26.1*

“The edition of the Old Testament compiled by Origen, in the 3rd century, consisting of the Hebrew text, a transliteration in Greek, and the Greek versions of Aquila, Symmachus, the Septuagint, Theodotion.”—Webster’s New International Dictionary, art. Hexapla.*RABV 27.1*

“Hexapla, the name given to Origen’s edition of the Old Testament in Hebrew and Greek, the most colossal critical production of Antiquity.”—Catholic Encyclopedia,” Vol. VII, p. 316.*RABV 27.2*

Thus the author’s severe strictures upon the alleged “depravations” in the New Testaments of these noted MSS. (the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus),—to which his treatment is virtually confined,—cannot in any sense be connected with the Hexapla of Origen which was limited to the Old Testament.*RABV 27.3*

Additional evidence in support of this fact is found in the paragraph from Dr. Ira M. Price, in his “Ancestry of our English Bible” (p. 70), and quoted by the author on p. 20, in which the statement is unequivocally made that the “fifty copies” of Scripture prepared for Constantine were of “the fifth column of the Hexapla.” Here is the precise quotation:*RABV 27.4*

“Eusebius of Caesarea (260-340), the first church historian, assisted by Pamphilus or vice versa, issued with all its critical marks the fifth column of the Hexapla, with alternative readings from the other columns, for use in Palestine. The Emperor Constantine gave

orders that fifty copies of this edition should be prepared for use in the churches.”*RABV 27.5*

But Dr. H. B. Swete, in “Introduction to the Old. Testament in Greek,” pp. 62, 63, gives a “specimen” of the Hexapla taken from *Psalms 45* which he says (p. 61) “will assist the reader to understand the arrangement of the columns.” They are in the following order, which of course agrees with the quotation above from “Webster”:*RABV 27.6*

“HEBREW Heb. TRANSLITERATION AQUILA SYMMACHUS L (SEPTUAGINT) THEODOTIION”*RABV 27.7*

An identical numerical listing is found in “The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge,” Vol. 8, p. 270, Art. “Origen” under “Hexapla,” where a similar specimen is exhibited, so there is no possible mistaking of the identity of the “Fifth column.”*RABV 28.1*

The conclusion is therefore unavoidable that the fifty copies of the Hexapla made for Constantine were of the fifth-column Septuagint, which is confined to the Old Testament Scriptures: and even if the MSS. Aleph and B were of the fifty, such could apply to their Old Testament sections only. Consequently the sustained attack of the author upon the alleged New Testament “depravations” in the Vaticanus (for example, p. 247), and his efforts to slur them by cataloguing them as of “Eusebio-Origen type” are entirely unwarranted, inasmuch as the Hexapla does not include the New Testament.*RABV 28.2*

We conclude these observations on the Hexapla and the Vaticanus by this illuminating excerpt from Thomas Hartwell Horne. It was written in 1839, fifteen years before the discovery of the Sinaitic MS., and provides food for enlightening thought:*RABV 28.3*

“On the ground of its internal excellence, Michaelis preferred the Vatican manuscript (for the New Testament) to the Codex Alexandrinus. If, however, that manuscript be most respectable which comes the nearest to Origen’s Hexaplar copy of the Septuagint Old Testament, the Alexandrian manuscript seems to claim that merit in preference to its rival [the Vaticanus]: but if it be

thought a matter of superior honour to approach nearer the old Greek version, uncorrected by Origen, that merit seems to be due to the Vatican.”—” An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, “Thomas Hartwell Horne, B. D. (1839), pp. 101, 102.*RABV 28.4*

Misquotation of Authorities

A flagrant example is found in the note on page 42, “The two great families of Greek Bibles are well illustrated in the work of that outstanding scholar Erasmus. Before he gave to the Reformation the New Testament in Greek, he divided all Greek MSS. into two classes: Those which agreed with the Received Text and those which agreed with the Vaticanus MS.” In justification of this remarkable assertion reference is made to “An Inquiry Into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate,” by Frederick Nolan, p. 413. But the following is the statement found in Nolan’s book, which was printed in 1815, before the most valuable manuscripts were available:*RABV 28.5*

“With reference to manuscripts, it is indisputable that he [Erasmus] was acquainted with every variety which is known to us; having distributed them into two principal classes, one of which corresponds with the Complutensian edition, the other with the Vatican manuscript.” (Italics ours.)*RABV 29.1*

It will be noted that in the quotation from the book under review the words “the Received Text” are substituted for “the Complutensian edition,” as found in the work to which reference is given. The significance of this change will be better appreciated when it is remembered that the Complutensian edition was a Roman Catholic text edited by Cardinal Ximenes, based upon MSS. loaned to him by the Pope, and printed just before the first edition of Erasmus was given to the public, but not circulated until a little later. It appears, then, according to the facts, as will be shown in Section II, that the comparison made by Erasmus was between one set of Vatican MSS. and the great Vatican MS. “B.” Such a deliberate perversion of fact is without excuse, and could only be made through gross carelessness, or under the pressure of the need of further authority to establish the claims of the author concerning the Received Text.*RABV 29.2*

On page 95 the author refers to *Romans 5:1*, using in an absolutely unwarranted way a mere marginal note in the A.R.V. (to the effect that some ancient authorities read “Let us have peace”), giving the impression that it is an alternative marginal reading,—which it is

not,—and utterly ignoring the reading of the text itself which is the same as in the Authorized Version. The author then infers that the A.R.V. is here in harmony with the Rheims Version which reads, “Let us have peace,” and refers to “Where Did We Get Our Bible?” (p. 182), by D. G. L. Robinson, as authority for the fact that the rendering, “Let us have peace,” “is a serious error of doctrine.”*RABV 30.1*

This is perhaps as striking a perversion of an authority as is found in this book. The chapter in the Robinson volume, in which the indicated paragraph is found, is devoted to justifying the claim made in the opening sentence that, “The last, the most important, and in many particulars the best English Version is that known as ‘The American Standard Revision,’” As one of the reasons for this claim, Dr. Robinson refers to the rendering of *Romans 5:1* as found in the text of the American Revised Version, “We have peace,” in contrast with the rendering, “Let us have peace,” as found in the Rheims Version. It is unnecessary to characterize such an unfair handling of an authority.*RABV 30.2*

We shall not carry this phase of review further, as no attempt has been made to completely survey the inaccuracies and misstatements that abound, but merely to cite examples.*RABV 30.3*

Conflict with the Spirit of Prophecy

Referring to the atonement, the author says: “Westcott believed that the death of Christ was of His human nature, not of His divine nature” (p. 158). Again on page 217, 218 he repeats the statement in different words thus: “Catholics teach that only the humanity of Christ died on the cross, not His divine nature.” And yet a third time on page 219, “They belittle the death of Christ when they rule out the death of His divine nature.” In view of this triple iteration, and the clear implication as to the author’s position, we respectfully submit this significant statement from the pen of Ellen G. White, and leave the reader to his own conclusions:*RABV 31.1*

“Was the human nature of the Son of Mary changed into the divine nature of the Son of God?—No: the two natures were mysteriously blended in one person,—the Man Christ Jesus. In Him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. When Christ was crucified, it was His human nature that died. Deity did not sink and die; that would have been impossible. Christ, the sinless One, will save every son and daughter of Adam who accepts the salvation proffered them, consenting to become the children of God. The Saviour has purchased the fallen race with His own blood.*RABV 31.2*

“This is a great mystery, a mystery that will not be fully, completely understood in its greatness until the translation of the redeemed shall take place.” (Italics ours.)—Ellen G. White (B-220-1906).*RABV 31.3*

Again, on page 246 the author says that “the new theology taught that Christianity was not ‘a system of truth divinely revealed, recorded in the Scriptures in a definite and complete form for all ages,’ but that Christianity is Christ.” (Italics ours. Again we wish to place a brief but significant declaration from the pen of Ellen G. White squarely beside the contention of the writer under review, and invite the reader to once more form his own conclusion. The remarkable three-word sentence is, “Christ is Christianity.” (*Gospel Workers*, 282, 283.)*RABV 31.4*

The misuse of an expression by an opponent must not be permitted to deprive us of its proper use. The fact that Sunday observers use

the term “Sabbath” to designate the first day does not deter us from vigorously utilizing it in its true end legitimate seventh-day intent, the Sunday keepers’ misuse to the contrary notwithstanding. Similarly, we must not be intimidated into abandonment of such expressions as “The Person of Christ” (pp. 19, 222) or “Christ is Christianity” (p. 246) because perverters may pour a wrong content into the words. Rather let us vigorously and independently pursue our heaven-appointed way. Our opponents have no patent rights upon specific terms. A great Fundamentalist scholar Great Britain did not hesitate to use the expression “Christ is Christianity” as the title of one of his excellent volumes. And Mrs. E. G. White says, “Christ crucified for our sins, Christ risen from the dead, Christ ascended on high, is the science of salvation that we are to learn and to teach.”—*Testimonies for the Church* 8:287.*RABV 32.1*

The author seeks to capture a Spirit of prophecy endorsement of the Authorized Version by stating: “Sister White seems to indicate our Authorized Version as a perfect Bible” (page 5 of leaflet accompanying book, and entitled, “The Attitude and Teachings of Mrs. E. G. White Toward the Different Versions of the Bible”). In proof of his statement the author says: “In *Early Writings*, 220, 221, Sister White was shown, that the Word of God was a ‘perfect chain.’ As there was no Revised Version then, may we not conclude that she pointed out the Authorized Version as ‘perfect’?”*RABV 32.2*

But the complete statement in “Early Writings” reads:*RABV 33.1*

“I saw that God had especially guarded the Bible, yet when copies of it were few, learned men had in some instances changed the words, thinking that they were making it more plain, when in reality they were mystifying that which was plain, by causing it to lean to their established views, which were governed by tradition. But I saw that the word of God, as a whole, is a perfect chain, one portion linking into and explaining another. True seekers for truth need not err; for not only is the word of God plain and simple in declaring the way of life, but the Holy Spirit is given as a guide in understanding the way to life therein revealed.”—*Early Writings*, 220, 221 (1907).*RABV 33.2*

What a basically different intent! The quotation has no bearing

whatsoever upon versions, but deals with the Bible as a whole in any language or version. It assures us as to the essential integrity of the whole, but plainly recognizes and declares there are minor inaccuracies or changes that crept in through the centuries. How comforting and steadying this statement!*RABV 33.3*

Sister White's Use of the Revised Version

The assertion of the author that Sister White used the Revised Version only as she would quote from some secular writer is most astounding. Quoting his precise words, the author declares that Sister White “uses it [the Revised Version] as a reference book, but not as an authority.” (Italics ours.) (Page 4 of same leaflet, “The Attitude and Teachings of Mrs. E. G. White Toward the Different Versions of the Bible.”) And again, on the same page, appears this expression: “Sister White used the American Revised Version as we may use it—as a book of reference.”*RABV 33.4*

This content on is utterly contrary to the patent facts of her practice. The Revised. Version was of course not yet in existence during the period of her most prolific writing, and so in the very nature of the case could not possibly have been used in the bulk of her productions. But the hundreds of texts from the Revised Version found in those of her books written after its appearance are used as from Scripture, precisely as are those from the King James, and are so listed in the “Scriptural Index” in such books without any differentiation. And they are directly quoted as the Word of God, and not as a conveniently phrased reference from some human authority.*RABV 33.5*

Mrs. White unquestionably had confidence in both versions. Most certainly she did not consider them antagonistic or mutually exclusive. It is apparent that she did not consider the English Revised and the A.R.V. as having been subjected to “systematic depravation,” and as pro-papal or Modernistic. Surely her example would indicate that we are warranted in doing as she did. We may rightly conclude, then, that Sister White did not regard the A.R.V. as a version to be condemned and avoided.*RABV 34.1*

Sister White's quotations from the Revised Version are not confined to brief excerpts, or better-worded phrases for certain difficult texts, but are often extensive sections of the Word, as on page 142 of “Education,” where seventeen verses from Job (R.V.) are introduced with the meaningful expression, “God has given us in His Word” (Italics ours)—and then follow the verses cited. Or, on page 160 of the same volume, we read the significant statement,

“The earliest song recorded in the Bible” (*Italics ours*)—and immediately Sister White proceeds to quote seven verses from *Exodus 15*, R.V. Again, on page 236, *Matthew 5:37* (R.V.) is introduced by this phrase, “God’s Word condemns” (*Italics ours*)—and the sacred words follow. As to the free use of the Revised Version citations, they range all the way from a single verse up to groups of twelve, sixteen, and even twenty-three verses.*RABV 34.2*

Another distortion of fact relative to Sister White’s use of the Revised Version, is conveyed in the author’s statement on page 4 of the same leaflet: “In volume eight of the Testimonies, Sister White quotes several times from the Revised Version, especially in the poetical Psalms.” (*Italics ours.*) The intent of the underscored phrase is apparent. But let us examine the actual facts. In one section alone of Volume VIII,—“The Essential Knowledge,”—the A.R.V. is quoted forty-seven times within the eighty pages of that division. And as to the implication that these were confined to the “poetical Psalms,” please note the contrary facts: These forty-seven references are, in the order used, from Isaiah, Jeremiah, Amos, Zechariah, Deuteronomy, Hosea, Micah, Zephaniah, Job, 1 Samuel, Proverbs, Exodus, and the Psalms, in the Old Testament; and from John, 1 Timothy, 1 Corinthians, Philemon, 2 Corinthians, and 1 Peter in the New Testament.*RABV 35.1*

Or, to take yet another example: In the book “Education” there are (according to its “Scriptural Index”) forty-five texts quoted from the Revised, and they are distributed as follows: *Genesis 1; Exodus 2; Numbers 3; 1 Chronicles 1; Job 5; Psalm 5; Proverbs 2; Ecclesiastes 2; Canticles, 1; Isaiah 1; Matthew 2; Luke 1; John 3; Romans 2; 1 Corinthians 3; 2 Corinthians 1; Ephesians 1; Philippians 1; Colossians 2; Hebrews 1; 1 Peter 1; and Revelation 4*. In other words, but five citations are from the Psalms, while the remaining forty are from twenty-one other books of Scripture scattered from Genesis to Revelation. And these forty-five references comprise one hundred forty-one verses of Scripture from the Revised Version.*RABV 35.2*

Bible Society Translations Not Confined to A.V

On page 257 the statement is made that the King James Version is translated into over eight hundred languages. But investigation upon this point brings the following information from the General Secretary of the American Bible Society, who speaks virtually for both the American and the British and Foreign organizations, and gives this authoritative word relative to the rules and practices governing these translations:*RABV 36.1*

“The policy recommended by the British and Foreign Bible Society in their rules for the guidance of translators, revisers and editors is that also recommended by this Society. I quote from the rules before mentioned:*RABV 36.2*

“The Committee of the Society desire that, wherever practicable, versions should be made and revised from the Original Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek, advantage being taken of any previous translations in the particular language, and of versions in cognate languages.*RABV 37.1*

“For the Old Testament, the latest Hebrew Bible published by the Society for the time being is its standard text, both as regards consonants and vowels,—liberty being given to Translators and Revisers to follow the Kethib or the Qeri, or renderings sanctioned by the English Authorized or Revised Versions, or by their marginal readings.*RABV 37.2*

“For the New Testament, Translators and Revisers are recommended to follow the text of the original Greek edited for the Society by Dr. Nestle, but are at liberty to follow that underlying the English Authorized Version ¹“Substantially the ‘Textus Receptus,’ but see Schaff Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Vol. II, p. 107, col. 1.—E.M.N.” (edited by Dr. Scrivener, for the Cambridge University Press), or that underlying the Revised Versions (edited by Archdeacon Palmer, for the Oxford University Press).*RABV 37.3*

“Translators who are unacquainted with the originals are desired to follow the text or margin of the English Authorized or Revised Versions, or, in the case of Translators unacquainted with English,

some other version sanctioned by the Committee.*RABV 37.4*

“Words or sentences for which the English Revisers in their Marginal notes declare that there exists ancient authority, should find a place either in the text or in the margin. The Committee deprecate their entire omission.*RABV 37.5*

“The American standard Edition of 1901 may be used instead of, or alongside of the English Versions. ’*RABV 37.6*

“We find that it is the usual practice of translators, in order to make their meaning clear to their readers, to consult many versions. The ‘Textus Receptus’ or ‘Received Text’ is now rather out of date because of the later discoveries of more ancient sources and of improved scholarship and most modern translations take advantage of this advance.*RABV 37.7*

“Both Societies endeavor to make sure that translations they print have been faithfully done and as literal as the idiom of the language will permit.”*RABV 37.8*

Signed: Eric M. North, General Secretary. Jan. 6, 1931.*RABV 37.9*

This letter is most illuminating. First, it is made clear that translation from the Authorized Version into a foreign language is allowed only in case the translator does not know the original language of the Bible, and that such a case is an exception to their general policy of translating from the original. Second, that the changes recognized by the English or American Revisers are to be placed either in text or margin, their omission being deprecated. And third, that the faulty character of the “Textus Receptus” is recognized by the responsible leadership of these great societies. It is thus apparent that it is not the King James Version which is translated into over eight hundred languages.*RABV 37.10*

The uncompromising position of the author, in the light of the import of this letter, raises the question as to whether or not he would commission Seventh-day Adventists to bring forth their own translations in every current language and dialect in order to be in literal conformity to the “Textus Receptus”*RABV 38.1*

A Strangely Related Discovery

The R.V. has been in the field for full fifty years, and the A.R.V. for thirty years. But the reverent and renowned textual critics of these decades, representing every branch of Protestantism, and devoting their lives to this specialized study (a field into which none of the representatives of this cause have made any serious excursions or contributions),—have failed to confirm the contention of the author. This is a phase of indirect evidence that cannot be minimized.*RABV 38.2*

That the ablest Protestant critics and scholars of the past half-century, who have had access to all the material cited by the author, and more, should have failed to seriously discern the hand of Rome or the bias of Modernism in the Revised Versions is more than passing strange; it is pointedly significant.*RABV 38.3*

Though the A.R.V. is published by Thomas Nelson & Sons, forty-two Protestant Evangelical denominations hold the copyright of the A.R.V. through the International Council of Religious Education, and in 1929 this was renewed for a period of 28 years. The general secretary of this organization, Hugh S. Magill, writing under date of Jan. 26, 1931, in response to an inquiry as to whether they were acquainted with serious challenge of the A.R.V. on the two counts of “Modernistic influence” and of “Catholic bias,” speaks as follows:*RABV 39.1*

“There is no justification whatever in the statement that the American Standard Bible is either Modernist or Fundamentalist. It is a faithful translation of the Scriptures without regard for conservative or liberal schools of thought and teaching, made by a very distinguished group of Biblical scholars during the last years of the previous century, and first published in 1901. It has been in general use for the past 30 years, and is carried today in parallel columns with the King James Version in such conservative papers as the Sunday School Times and others.*RABV 39.2*

“We have no collation of the views or comments on the issuance of the American Standard Bible, but we do know that it is in very general use, particularly among Biblical scholars of all

denominations and different faiths. The suggestion that there was Roman Catholic influence in the Revision Committee has never been raised before that we knew of, and we think there is no ground whatever for it. There were no Catholics on the Revision Committee, and if it had been influenced as suggested the question would have been raised years ago.*RABV 39.3*

“The 42 Protestant Evangelical denominations represented in the International Council of Religious Education, which owns the copyright to this edition of the Bible, all regard it with favor, and I think practically all of them use it in preparing their Sunday School lesson helps.”*RABV 39.4*

If we were to accept denominationally the unproven assertions of the volume under review,—as to a pro-Roman and Modernistic bias of the A.R.V.,—we would become the laughing stock of the reverent Christian scholarship of the world, which we are commissioned also to reach with our message, and would thereby increase immeasurably the difficulty which already confronts us in the prosecution of our task. And whatever perils may assail the Sacred word in the future have absolutely no bearing whatsoever upon the purely historic experiences of the past.*RABV 39.5*

An Epitome of the Findings of This Section

The book before us is manifestly not an unbiased examination of facts; instead, there is hopeless confusion of fact, conjecture, and assertion. There are many fine passages, but the author often rises to a grandiloquent style to dazzle and impress, forgetting that assertion or inference is not proof. The volume abounds in illogical conclusions clothed in oratorical garb. Constructive textual criticism is confused with destructive higher criticism in unwarranted and fantastic ways. In many places the argument is plainly built upon an appeal to religious and denominational prejudice rather than upon solid facts or a legitimate appeal to reason. It takes advantage of the unfamiliarity of the average reader with the facts alleged, and to which the average reader cannot possibly have access.*RABV 40.1*

The “vindication” unquestionably represents a large amount of research. But no matter how vast one’s examination, if his premises and operating principles are not sound, his conclusions are necessarily faulty, and an intensified study of this character can easily become an obsession. Many authorities are cited in the reference footnotes. But their often claimed support is frequently misleading because citations are often used to support an unwarranted inference, instead of sound facts, and are sometimes perverted to support such claims. Instead of a “systematic depravation of Scripture” by the Revisers, as the author claims, there is in fact a systematic misuse of evidence by the author.*RABV 40.2*

To afford a convenient survey of the fundamental points in Section I, we summarize briefly as follows:*RABV 41.1*

1. The author violated established denominational procedure in publishing his volume.*RABV 41.2*
2. The author constantly violates the primal laws of evidence in his misuse of authorities; many of the quotations used not sustaining the contentions for which they are cited.*RABV 41.3*
3. He casts unjustifiable aspersion upon those who prefer the A.R.V.*RABV 41.4*

4. There is gross misrepresentation of the character and intent of the changes as between the Authorized and the Revised Versions.*RABV 41.5*

5. The author's arbitrarily created "two parallel streams of Bibles" is shown not to rest upon historical authority, and the "changes" between the A.V. and A.R.V. are shown to be but minor deviations of what is substantially one identical, fundamental text.*RABV 41.6*

6. The contention upon the "Itala,"—as the pure Bible of the Waldenses, and descended from apostolic origin,—is shown to be untenable.*RABV 41.7*

7. The attempt of the author to connect the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus MSS. of the New Testament with the Hexapla of Origen,—which was solely an Old Testament text,—is exposed.*RABV 41.8*

8. The contention upon the corrupting influence of Westcott and Hort over the A.R.V., and the Revision Committee, is shown to be unjustified.*RABV 41.9*

9. The frequent misuse and mis-quotation of authorities are exposed by typical examples.*RABV 41.10*

10. The mis-statements of the author relative to modern foreign translations,—and the conflict of his premises with the governing rules for the Bible Societies' translations,—is exposed.*RABV 42.1*

11. The unfair allegation of the author relative to the attitude and practice of Ellen G. White toward the Revised versions is unmasked.*RABV 42.2*

The triple contention of the author, (1) that the Greek text upon which the A.R.V. is based is seriously corrupted by papal influence; (2) that the translated product is dangerously pro-papal or clearly biased toward Modernism, and (3) that the Received Text is the pure, uncorrupted, apostolic Scripture transmitted without substantial change through the centuries, is, on the basis of this general survey of the volume, clearly overthrown. But the findings of this division will be strongly augmented in Sections II and III, where critical and cumulative evidence is presented completely, and we

believe conclusively, covering the basically fallacious argument on the “pure Greek text of Erasmus,” as well as the technical features relating to the texts cited in chapters VI, XI, and XII.*RABV 42.3*

The uncalled for and untimely appearance of this book has unfortunately opened a question that should properly remain closed by this people. We have difficulties enough in the prosecution of our world task, without this added controversy concerning the versions. But to the presentation of our distinctive message with its unpopular teachings, we are already sufficiently misunderstood, misquoted, and opposed by all other religious bodies over the clear issue of their rejection of present day light and truth. And now there is gratuitously added a needless cause for misunderstanding and ridicule by reverent scholars and Bible lovers, for such a volume will be justly construed as an attack upon the very Bible itself.*RABV 42.4*

Section II: On the Bible MSS in General

On Catholic influence.—So much is said by the author about the “pure Greek text of Erasmus,” about the mutilating and corrupting of other texts, and especially about Romanizing and Modernizing influences being manifest in the MSS used and the translation made by the Revisers of the King James Version of the Bible, that it is necessary to give some attention to Greek MSS in general before dealing with the scriptures cited by the author to prove his contention. He stakes all on the pureness and integrity of Erasmus’ Greek Testament, endeavoring to show that Greek MSS came down uncorrupted through the centuries from the apostles by way of Syria, Constantinople, and the Waldenses, into the hands of Erasmus, while another stream of mutilated and corrupted MSS came down via Rome and the papacy.*RABV 43.1*

Without in any sense desiring to depreciate the work of Erasmus in the part he acted in bringing out in available form the Greek text of the New Testament scriptures, nor the influence this work had on the Reformation and the circulation of the Bible among the common people, nevertheless the author’s handling of the whole question of texts and versions makes it necessary to bring out many facts which he ignores. Without desiring, either, to discredit the work of Catholic scholars on the texts and versions, it is necessary also, in view of the author’s contentions, to state the following facts bearing upon the Catholic setting of Erasmus and his work:*RABV 43.2*

1. Erasmus himself was a Catholic.*RABV 43.3*
2. His own Bible was the Catholic Vulgate, both before and after he issued his Greek Testament, and he printed the Vulgate along with his Greek Testament in the second edition.*RABV 43.4*
3. He dedicated his Greek Testament to Pope Leo X, and printed the latter’s letter of approval in his second edition.*RABV 43.5*
4. Erasmus’ Greek Text was not the first one printed, though it was first to go into circulation.*RABV 44.1*
5. The first Greek text was printed by Cardinal Ximenes in 1514,

two years before Erasmus' first edition came out in 1516, but was not generally circulated till 1522, owing to the death of the Cardinal in 1517.*RABV 44.2*

6. Erasmus knew of Cardinal Ximenes' Greek text, known as the Complutensian, was in correspondence with the Cardinal's chief editor Stunica, and used the Complutensian to make over 100 corrections in his own fourth edition.*RABV 44.3*

7. Cardinal Ximenes had a number of scholars at work on his edition of the Bible in the original as early as 1502, while Erasmus worked alone on his text for publication for less than a year, and according to his own testimony, did the work hastily, to aid his employer in outstripping the Ximenes' edition in circulation.*RABV 44.4*

The facts recited here will be found in authoritative quotations that follow pertaining to the Received Text. They are presented here for the purpose of showing that if Catholic editorship by Erasmus, his use of the Catholic Vulgate, his use of the Catholic Complutensian text of Cardinal Ximenes in correcting the mother-edition of the Received Text, his dedication of the whole work to Pope Leo, and his printing the Pope's imprimatur in his second edition, could result in "a pure Greek text," as the author affirms and repeats, what can be said of the work of 25 English scholars and 12 American scholars on the Revised Version over a period of ten years when not a soul of them was a Catholic, when no change was made in the text without a two-thirds vote, and when they worked under the pledge that "no article of faith, no moral precept, will be disturbed, no sectarian views will be introduced?" 2"Revised New Testament and History of Revision," pages 90, 91.*RABV 44.5*

On Erasmus' use of MSS.—Again, the author has much to say in defense of the meager MSS used by Erasmus. He seriously overstates himself when, admitting that Erasmus "used only a few," he exclaims, "What matters? ... If the few Erasmus used were typical... did he not, with all the problems before him, arrive at practically the same result which only could be arrived at today by a fair and comprehensive investigation?" (Page 54) That is, was not the textual work of Catholic Erasmus working single-handed in the

sixteenth century, with a small number of MSS available, as accurate and reliable as that of 37 of the best Protestant scholars in England and America, working for ten years with 4000 MSS available to check and compare? Again let the facts on the MSS speak for themselves:*RABV 45.1*

1. Erasmus actually used only six or possible seven was with the most liberal count.*RABV 45.2*

2. These are all still at Basle, except that for Revelation, a mutilated copy he had to borrow.*RABV 45.3*

3. None of these date back farther than the twelfth century, are described by scholars as “neither ancient nor valuable,” are not listed among the major MSS by any authority, and are not found in any of the great libraries or museums of Europe or America.*RABV 45.4*

4. In the book of Revelation, Erasmus supplied all the last six verses, and words or phrases in 21 other Places in that book, either by translation from the Catholic Vulgate or by his own words—and this besides supplying words elsewhere in the New Testament from memory or from notes he had taken in his travel.*RABV 45.5*

5. Erasmus was honest enough to record his procedure in his own words as follows: “some words I found in ours (the vulgate) which were lacking in the Greek, so these we added from the Latin.” He also saws his first edition was “precipitated, not edited.”*RABV 45.6*

6. In later editions, Erasmus made interpolation of one verse in Acts from a MSS margin, and one in 1 John from a Dublin MS, both of which have since been proved spurious.*RABV 46.1*

7. In the fourth and mother-edition of the Received Text, Erasmus made over 100 corrections from the Catholic Complutensian edition which he had not seen when his earlier editions were brought out.*RABV 46.2*

None of these facts are here cited for the purpose of discrediting the work of Erasmus, which in spite of its defects played a remarkable part in the Reformation and in the circulation of the

Scriptures. But these facts are all sustained by authoritative quotations that follow, and are cited here to show the fallacy of the author's unreasonable contention that the New Testament of Erasmus was "a pure Greek text," inherited through a direct line from the Apostles, and gave us the Authorized version as the only safe and reliable translation for our present use. The providence of God in safeguarding the inspired word through the centuries is not at all in question. But when Luther's conversion to righteousness by faith came through reading for himself a Catholic Bible in a Catholic convent while himself yet a Catholic, it is preposterous to try to make it appear, as the author so strenuously does try, that the resistance to false teaching and the resulting persecution of the Waldenses and millions of other Christians by Rome, was a matter of Greek texts and translations and versions. Everyone knows it was chiefly a matter of interpretation and perversion of truth as it is found abundantly in any of the great outstanding versions of the Holy Scriptures.*RABV 46.3*

On MSS in general.—The following quotation on dealing with MSS in general is taken from some rather extended notes accompanying the Greek text of the New Testament resulting from the critical work of Westcott and Hort, who spent the better part of twenty-five years in the collation and the editing of the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament.*RABV 46.4*

Great bulk of words unquestioned.—"This brief account of the text of the New Testament would be incomplete without a word of caution against a natural misunderstanding. Since textual criticism has various readings for its subject, and the discrimination of genuine readings from corruptions for its aim, discussions on textual criticism almost invariably obscure the simple fact that variations are but secondary incidents of a fundamentally single and identical text. In the New Testament in particular it is difficult to escape an exaggerated impression as to the proportion which the words subject to variation bear to the whole text, and also, in most cases, as to their intrinsic importance. It is not superfluous therefore to state explicitly that the great bulk of the words of the New Testament stand out above all discriminative processes of criticism, because they are free from variation, and need only to be transcribed. Much too of the variation which it is necessary to

record has only an antiquarian interest except in so far as it supplies evidence as to the history of textual transmission, or as to the characteristics of some document or group of documents.”—“The New Testament in Original Greek,” by Westcott and Hort, reprint of 1889, pp. 564, 565.*RABV 47.1*

Not more than one in a thousand questioned.—“The whole area of variation between readings that have ever been admitted, or are likely to be ever admitted, into any printed texts is comparatively small; and a large part of it is due merely to differences between the early uncritical editions and the texts formed within the last half-century with the help of the priceless documentary evidence brought to light in recent times. A small fraction of the gross residue of disputed words alone remains after the application of the improved methods of criticism won from the experience of nearly two centuries of investigation and discussion. If comparative trivialities, such as changes of order, the insertion or omission of the article with proper names, and the like are set aside, the words in our opinion still subject to doubt can hardly amount to more than a thousandth part of the whole New Testament.”—Idem.*RABV 47.2*

Textual uncertainty at a minimum.—“Nor must it be forgotten how strong an assurance of incorruptness in the unvarying parts of the text of the New Testament is supplied indirectly by many of the variations which do exist, inasmuch as they carry us back by the convergence of independent lines of transmission to a concord of testimonies from the highest antiquity; or again what unusually ample resources of evidence the New Testament possesses for the reduction of the area of textual uncertainty to a minimum. The apparent ease and simplicity with which many ancient texts are edited might be thought, on a hasty view, to imply that the New Testament cannot be restored with equal security. But this ease and simplicity is in fact the mark of evidence too scanty to be tested; whereas in the variety and fullness of the evidence on which it rests the text of the New Testament stands absolutely and unapproachably alone among ancient prose writings.” Idem.*RABV 47.3*

It will of course be recognized that this quotation has to do with the original Greek text of the New Testament, and not with the

translation of that text. Many changes have been made for the better by the revisers in the translation of the Greek text where the text is the same as was used by the translators of the AV. *RABV*
49.1

The Received Text

The fundamental question in the matter of versions is whether the Textus Receptus, or “Received Text,” as established in the early part of the sixteenth century by the work of Erasmus and Stephens, and used by the translators of the AV, is an absolutely correct text, as the author affirms, or whether it is subject to revision on the basis of the convincing testimony furnished by later discoveries, researches, and improved scholarship.*RABV 49.2*

The author, after discussing the translation of the Bible by Wycliffe, states his view of the Textus Receptus in these words: “Then appeared the translation into English of Tyndale from the pure Greek text of Erasmus.” (Page 50).*RABV 49.3*

The author furnishes no proof that the text of Erasmus was “the pure Greek text,” leaving his assertion to rest wholly upon his own unsupported authority. In marked contrast with his view, are the facts as presented by the leading textual scholars of our time. As this question of the Received Text, first prepared by Erasmus, is a fundamental one in this connection, it is important that the facts should be known. It is impossible to present all of the testimony bearing upon this matter, as that would require a small volume in itself, but the following are typical of many others:*RABV 49.4*

Work of Erasmus on his first edition.—“The enterprising and scholarly publisher of that city, Basle, John Froben, wrote on 15th March to Erasmus, who was then in England, and summoned him to Basle to undertake the edition. This the versatile scholar agreed to do, and the pair worked with such incredible speed that the volume issued from the press on 1st March 1516. The task took only ten months, and probably not more than about seven manuscripts were employed, most of which are still at Basle. The manuscripts, with one exception (now numbered 1), were neither ancient nor valuable. The last six verses of the Apocalypse were wanting in the only manuscript of that book he had, and he retranslated them (except verse 20, where he had Laurentius Valla’s translation) from the Vulgate Latin (the Roman Catholic text) owing to what he had done. The book is full of printer’s errors, and in the Apocalypse the Complutensian (the Greek text of Cardinal

Ximenes) gives a better text. Erasmus added a Latin translation of his own, and exploratory notes.”—” The Text and Canon of the New Testament,” Alexander Souter, p. 95.*RABV 49.5*

Erasmus’ interpolations and alterations in the Greek.—“For the Apocalypse he (Erasmus) had only an imperfect MS, which belonged to Reuchlin. The last six verses were wanting, and these he translated from the Latin, a process which he adopted in other places where it was less excusable. The received text contains two memorable instances of this bold interpolation. The one is *Acts 8:37*, which Erasmus, as he says, found written in the margin of a Greek MS, though it was wanting in that which he used: the other is *Acts 9:5, 6*, *schleron soi-anastethi for alla anastethi*, which has been found as yet in no Greek MS whatsoever, though it is still perpetuated on the ground of Erasmus’ conjecture.”—“Smith’s Dictionary of the Bible,” Vol. II, p. 522.*RABV 50.1*

“According to Mill (Proleg. 1120), Erasmus altered the text in a little more than fifty places in the Acts, and in about two hundred places in the Epistles, of which changes all but about forty were improvements. Specimens of the corrections on the margin of the MS are given by Wetstein (Proleg. p. 56 ed. Lotze). Of these several were simply on the authority of the Vulgate, one of which, *Matthew 2:11*, *heuron for eidon*, has retained its place in the received text.”—*Idem*, Footnote.*RABV 50.2*

Erasmus’ edition dedicated to Pope Leo X.—“The edition of Erasmus, like the Complutensian, was dedicated to Leo X.; and it is a noble trait of the generosity of Cardinal Ximenes, that when Stunica wished to disparage the work of Erasmus, which robbed him of his well-earned honour, he checked him in the words of Moses, ‘I would that all might thus prophesy,’ *Numbers 11:29* (Tregelles, p. 19.)” *Idem*.*RABV 50.3*

Erasmus’ own estimate of his first edition in 1516.—“Erasmus began to print his edition on the 11th of September 1515, and it was done by the 1st of March 1516. Froben, the printer and publisher, had heard of the Alcala edition (the Complutensian), and was anxious to get his edition out ahead of it. He was successful enough in this effort, for Erasmus did not get sight of a copy of that other

New Testament until after his own third edition of the year 1522 was done. It was not strange that such a hasty edition as Erasmus' first edition was, should have many faults. Erasmus praised his own edition in a letter to the pope, but he elsewhere conceded that it was done headlong rather than edited.' The manuscripts which he followed most closely were younger (later) ones. As for the Revelation Erasmus had but one mutilated manuscript, and he supplied what was lacking by translating the words from the Vulgate into his imperfect Greek. In one verse, if we may refer to a special one, he omits the article six times, where it should stand."—"The Canon and Text of the New Testament," by Caspar Rene Gregory,"—p. 441.*RABV 50.4*

Erasmus' second edition in 1519 endorsed by Pope Leo X.—"The second edition, of the year 1519, contains Leo X's approving letter of September 10, 1518."—Idem.*RABV 51.1*

Erasmus' third edition in 1522 added a spurious passage from a Dublin MS.—"The third edition was issued in the year 1522, and it was this edition that, alas! brought the baleful verse *1 John 5:7, 8* out of that worthless manuscript at Dublin."—Idem.*RABV 51.2*

"In 1519 Erasmus issued a revised edition, correcting many misprints, and inserting improved readings from Evan. 3; and three more editions appeared in his lifetime, in 1522, 1527, and 1535."—"Handbook to Textual Criticism of the New Testament," Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, K. C. B., F. B. A., pp. 269, 270.*RABV 51.3*

"*This edition is notable for its introduction of the passage relating to the Three Heavenly Witnesses (*1 John 5:7, 8*). In controversy with Stunica, Erasmus had promised to insert it if any Greek manuscript could be produced in which it occurred. It was found (in a clumsy form) in a manuscript in England (61, now at Dublin), and Erasmus, though rightly supposing that it was due merely to retranslation from the Latin, inserted it in fulfilment of his promise. Hence the passage (for which there is early Latin authority) found its way into the Textus Receptus."—Idem, Footnote.*RABV 51.4*

"A third edition was required in 1522, when the Complutensian Polyglot also came into circulation, in this edition *1 John 5:7* was inserted for the first time, according to the promise of Erasmus, on

the authority of the ‘Codex Britannicus’ (i. e. Cod. Montfortianus), in a form which obviously betrays its origin as a clumsy translation from the Vulgate.”—“*Smith’s Dictionary of the Bible*,” Vol. II, p. 522.*RABV 51.5*

Erasmus’ fourth edition in 1527 included the Catholic Vulgate.—“The fourth edition of the year 1527 contained not only the Greek text with Erasmus’ translation, but also the text of the Vulgate.”—“The Canon and Text of the New Testament,” by Caspar Rene Gregory, p. 441.*RABV 51.6*

Erasmus’ fourth edition corrected from Cardinal Ximenes’ Complutensian edition.—“Erasmus at length obtained a copy of the Complutensian text, and in his fourth edition in 1527, gave some various readings from it in addition to those which he had already noted, and used it to correct his own text in the Apocalypse in 90 places, while elsewhere he introduced only 16 changes (Hill, § 1141).”—*Smith’s Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. II, pp. 522, 523.*RABV 51.7*

Erasmus’ fourth edition in 1527 was mother-edition to the Received Text and the Authorized Version.—“Each of these (editions) contains some alterations, and that of 1527 being noticeable for its use of the Complutensian edition (mainly in the Apocalypse) and for its introduction of the Vulgate text by the side of the Greek and Erasmus’s Latin. This edition of 1527 may be considered as Erasmus’s definitive text, that of 1535 shearing but very few alterations.”—“Handbook to Textual Criticism of the New Testament,” Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, K. C. B., F. B. A., pp. 269, 270, Foot Note.*RABV 51.8*

“Such was the fourth edition of Erasmus, the mother-edition of the Textus Receptus and of our own Authorized version. It was based, as we have seen, on scanty evidence and late manuscripts. It contains two interpolations which the editor himself introduced on his own responsibility, viz., *Acts 8:37*, and words in *Acts 9:5, 6*. It is especially unsatisfactory in the Revelation. Where in any degree dependent on a version, it is dependent only on a very bad and even deformed text of the Vulgate.”—“The Revision of the English Version of the New Testament,” Lightfoot, Trench, and Ellicott, p. 38

of Ellicott's portion.*RABV 52.1*

"The fourth edition afterwards became the basis of the received text."—"Smith's Dictionary of the Bible," Vol. II, p. 523.*RABV 52.2*

Estimate of Erasmus' work by scholars.—"The Greek Text (of Erasmus) was accompanied by a Latin translation and some notes, which Erasmus had had in hand before Froben's proposal. Work so rapidly produced could not rest on any great accumulation of material, and although the publisher's preface speaks of the use of many ancient manuscripts and of the quotations of all the most important Fathers, it would appear that in reality only a few manuscripts were employed—those, namely, which lay ready to the editor's hand at Basle. These for the most part, were neither ancient nor good, and the single manuscript employed for the Apocalypse was deficient in the in last six verses of the book, which Erasmus accordingly supplied by retranslation from the Vulgate. Some words of this retranslation, which occur in no manuscript whatever, still linger in our Textus Receptus to the present day. Similar retranslations, to supply real or supposed Lacunas (gaps), were also occasionally made in other places. The edition of Erasmus consequently has little critical value, and is inferior in this respect to the consequently has little value and is inferior in this respect to the Complutensian; yet it has exercised a far greater influence on the history of the New Testament text. In the first place it had six years start of its rival; and being issued in a single volume of reasonable size and price, it had a far wider circulation than the six-volume Complutensian of which only 600 copies were printed. Hence it followed the foundation of the editions which followed it at short intervals during the next generation."—"Handbook to Textual Criticism of the New Testament," Sir Frederic G. Kenyon, K. C. B., F. B. A., pp. 269, 270, Foot Note.*RABV 52.3*

"It is almost painful to be obliged to remember that a portion of ten months at the utmost could have been devoted to his task by Erasmus; while the only manuscripts he can be imagined to have constantly used are Codd. Eva. 2, Act. Paul. 1 and Act. Paul 4, (all still at Basle) for the remainder of the New Testament, to which add Apoc. 1, now happily recovered, alone for the apocalypse. All these, excepting Evan. Act. Paul. 1, were neither ancient nor particularly

valuable, and of Cod. 1 he professed to make but small account. As Apoc. 1 was mutilated in the last six verses, Erasmus turned these into Greek from the Latin; and some portions of his self-made version, which are found (however some editors speak vaguely) in no one known Greek Manuscript whatever, still cleave to our received text.”—” A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament,” Frederick Henry Ambrose Scrivener, Vol. II, pp. 183, 184.*RABV 52.4*

“*Erasmus in his Annotations fairly confesses what he did: ‘quanquam in calce hujus libri, nonnulla verba reperi apud nostros, quae aberant in Graecis exemplaribus, ea tamen ex latinis adjecimus.’ (‘Although at the end of this book (the Revelation) some words I found in ours (the Vulgate) which were lacking in the Greek, so these were added from the Latin.’) But since the text and commentary in Cod. Reuchlini are so mixed up as to be undistinguishable in parts without the aid of a second manuscript (Tregelles’ ‘Delitzsch’s Handschriftliche Funde,’ Part ii. pp. 2-7), it is no wonder that in other places Erasmus in his perplexity was sometimes tempted to translate into his own Greek from the Latin Vulgate such words or clauses as he judged to have been wrongly passed over by his sole authority, e. g. *ch* 2:2, 17; 3:5, 12, 15; 6:11, 15 (see under Apoc. 1); 7:17; 13:4, 5; 14:16; 22:11, where the Greek words only of Erasmus are false; while in *ch* 2:3; 5:14 (bis); 6:1, 3, 5, 7; 13:10; 14:5 (as partly in 22:14), he was misled by the recent copies of the Vulgate, whereto alone he had access, to make additions which no Greek manuscript is known to support.”—Footnote in “A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament,” Frederick Henry Ambrose Scrivener, p. 184.*RABV 52.5*

“The fourth edition afterwards became the basis of the received text. This, it will be seen, rested on scanty and late Greek evidence, without the help of any versions except the Latin, which was itself so deformed in common copies, as not to show its true character and weight.”—” Smith’s Dictionary of the Bible,” Vol. II, p. 523.*RABV 53.1*

Here is the latest word from an outstanding scholar in America, author of both a grammar and a lexicon of New Testament Greek:*RABV 53.2*

“The Complutensian Edition of the Greek New Testament of Cardinal Francisco Ximenes de Cisneros was printed in 1514, though not circulated till 1522. Erasmus produced his edition in 1516 and so won in the race with Cisneros, though at the cost of accuracy in many ways and only by the hurried use of a few late minuscules (cursives in small letters) and thus laid the foundation for the Textus Receptus which held the field till the critical text of Westcott and Hort, in 1881.”—Prof. A. T. Robertson, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in the Biblical Review, January, 1931.*RABV 53.3*

Estimate of the Received Text.—“Such is the history of our received text of the Greek New Testament; and it will be obvious from it how little livelihood there was that it would be a really accurate representation of the original language. For fourteen hundred years the New Testament had been handed down in manuscript, copy being taken from copy in a long succession through the centuries, each copy multiplying and spreading errors (slight, indeed, but not unimportant in the mass) after the manner described in our first chapter. Yet when this great invention of printing took place, and the words of the Bible could at last be stereotyped, as it were, beyond the reach of human error, the first printed text was made from a mere handful of manuscripts, and those some of the latest and least trustworthy that existed. There was no thought of searching out the oldest manuscripts and trusting chiefly to them. The best manuscripts were still unknown to scholars or inaccessible and the editors had to content themselves with using such later copies as were within their reach, generally those in their native town alone. Even those were not always copied with such accuracy as we should now consider necessary. The result is that the text accepted in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, to which we have clung from a natural reluctance to change the words which we have learnt as those of the Word of God, is in truth full of inaccuracies, many of which can be corrected with absolute certainty from the vastly wider information which is at our disposal today. The difference between the Authorized Version and the Revised Version shows in great measure the difference between the text accepted at the time of the first printed editions and that which commends itself to the best modern scholars. We do not find the fundamentals of our faith altered, but we find many variations of

words and sentences, and are brought so much nearer to the true Word of God, as it was written down in the first century by Evangelist and Apostle.”—Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts,” F. G. Kenyon, Librarian, etc. pp. 99, 100.*RABV 53.4*

The Vaticanus Manuscript

The author endeavors to create the impression that the Vatican manuscript is a corrupted papal document, and refers to it in a slurring manner as having been “for man knows not how long, upon a shelf in the Pope’s palace,” and as being “of uncertain ancestry, of questionable history, and of suspicious character.” (p. 178.) No proof is submitted to substantiate this position, and the reader is evidently expected to accept such assertions upon the unsupported declaration of the author. Of course it is easy to appeal to religious prejudice by emphasizing the word Vatican and by assuming that any manuscript which has been handled by Roman Catholics must necessarily have been tampered with, when such a method will serve the author’s purpose.*RABV 54.1*

In marked contrast with the unsupported assertions of the author in his effort to discredit the Vatican manuscript are the statements of recognized scholars in the field of textual criticism. Dr. F. H. A. Scrivener, whom the author declares to be “probably the foremost scholar of the day in the manuscripts of the Greek New Testament and the history of the text” (p. 169), declares: “We accord to Cod. B (the Vatican manuscript) at least as much weight as to any single document in existence.” His full statement runs thus:*RABV 54.2*

Vatican MS equal to the best.—“Those who agree the most unreservedly respecting the age of the Codex Vaticanus, vary widely in their estimate of its critical value. By some it has been held in such undue esteem that its readings, if probable in themselves, and supported (or even though not supported) by two or three other copies and versions, have been accepted in preference to the united testimony of all authorities besides: while others, admitting the interest due to age, have spoken of its text as one of the most vicious extant. Without anticipating what must be discussed hereafter we may say at once, that while we accord to Cod. B at least as much weight as to any single document in existence, we ought never to forget that it is but one out of many, several of them being nearly (and one quite) as old, and in other respects not less worthy of confidence than itself.”—A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament,” by F. H. A. Scrivener, H. A., D. C. L., LL. D., Fourth edition of the Rev. Edward Miller, H. A., Vol. 1, p.

The following testimony is taken from a book which is used in our own colleges as a standard text book:*RABV 55.1*

Vatican MS on the whole the best and oldest.—“Most New Testament Textual critics agree that B (Vaticanus) is, upon the whole, the best and oldest of the known manuscripts, but it must not be given absolute authority over all others. Westcott and Hort made large use of it in their text of the New Testament. In fact, both the Sinaitic and the Vatican codices until very recent times have not been accorded their full meed of authority. The Alexandrian codex had so long held the field almost alone, that only the strongest of arguments could win for these new documents in the field of New Testament criticism their proper places. B gives us, as does S, (Sinaiticus) ‘the simplest, shortest and concisest text.’ The charge that many important words are omitted is imaginary, say Westcott and Hort (p. 557). If B and S agree there is usually strong evidence for the genuineness of a reading; if it is supported by ante-Nicene testimony it is conclusive. Such concurrent testimony gives us the most ancient readings, that way be traced to within a century of the time when the original autographs were penned.”—“The Ancestry of Our English Bible,” by Ira Faurice Price, Ph.D., pp. 152, 153.*RABV 55.2*

The next two quotations are from works of recognized value in the field of textual criticism:*RABV 55.3*

Vatican MS most valuable of all.—“The oldest vellum MS., and the most valuable of all existing MSS. of the New Testament, is that commonly known as B (Codex Vaticanus graecus, 1209). This MS. has been in the Vatican Library, Rome, at least since the year 1481, in which one of the oldest extant catalogues was made. It once contained the whole Greek Bible, with the exception of the Books of Maccabees and the possible exception of the Apocalypse. In its actual state the New Testament lacks the Epistle to the Hebrews from *chap. 9. ver. 14*, the Pastoral Epistles, and the Epistle to Philemon also. The existence, and also the merits of the MS., were to some extent known in previous centuries, and during the nineteenth century our knowledge of it became gradually more and

more accurate, the climax being reached in the superb photograph issued by Hoepli of Milan in 1904.”—“The Text and Canon of the New Testament,” by Alexander Souter, p. 20.*RABV 55.4*

“This Vatican manuscript is considered by a great many scholars to be the best of all the New Testament manuscripts. The Sinaitic and the Vatican are, from the standpoint of the history of the text as thus far known, by far the two best witnesses for the oldest text. Wherever they were written and at whatever date, they represent, it would appear, as both Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort thought, good manuscripts of the second century. The word good is to be emphasized here. If the given view be correct, they represent not the current re-wrought, worked over manuscripts of the second century, but such as retained in an eminent degree the text which had come to that century from the hands of the original writers. The Vatican manuscript shows in the Epistles of Paul a few readings from those current manuscripts of the second century, but not very many.”—“The Canon and Text of the New Testament,” by Caspar Rene Gregory, pp. 347, 343.*RABV 56.1*

In a recent book, “Where Did We Get Our Bible?” by “Rev. George L. Robinson, Ph. D, DD., LL. D., Professor of Biblical Literature and English Bible in Presbyterian Theological Seminary of Chicago,” the following statement is found concerning the Vatican manuscript:*RABV 56.2*

Vatican HS most ancient and of incalculable value.—“Codex Vaticanus. This is regarded as probably the most ancient of all the Greek MSS. now known to exist. It is designated as Codex’ B.’ In 1448 Pope Nicholas V brought it to Rome where it has lain practically ever since, being guarded assiduously by papal officials in the Vatican library.... The value of the Codex as an ancient witness to the text of the Bible is incalculably great!”—pp. 110, 113.*RABV 56.3*

On pages 122, 123 of this same book there is printed a tabular statement concerning “Ancient Bible Manuscripts Still in Existence.” On page 122 the Vatican manuscript is declared to be “Oldest and Best of All Greek MSS.”*RABV 56.4*

Here also is the testimony of a scholar who can be recognized as

an expert in judging manuscripts:*RABV 56.5*

Vatican HS unquestionably superior in accuracy and authenticity.—The natural conclusion, therefore, would seem to be that the B, (Vaticanus) text (accepted by Westcott and Hort) still holds the position of superiority which was secured for it by the searching criticism of II; and this, on the whole, is probably the prevalent view today.... It is now, therefore, easy to obtain a text of the NT based upon the best available witnesses, as arrived at by a consensus of the most competent critics, and unquestionably superior in accuracy and authenticity to the TR. (Textus Receptus).”—F. G. Kenyon, Librarian of Manuscripts in the British Museum, in “Dictionary of the Bible,” by James Hastings, pp. 928, 929.*RABV 56.6*

In view of the nature of the foregoing testimony and in view of the scholarship and standing of these Protestant writers, no argument is required to establish the conclusion that the author of this book under review has taken a prejudiced view of the MSS, and that his estimate of the Vatican manuscript rests upon no basis worthy of confidence.*RABV 56.7*

It is nothing short of amazing to find that one who apparently fools competent to enter the field of Biblical criticism, designates the Greek historian Eusebius as “the author of the Vaticanus” (p. 22), while in the same book he strangely declares it to be “of uncertain ancestry” (p. 178).*RABV 57.1*

Question of Catholic Influence.—Constant effort is made in this book to show that the R.V., and especially the A.R.V., has been greatly influenced by the Rheims New Testament, translated by Roman Catholics and published at Rheims in 1582, about thirty years before the A. V. was published. On the other hand, this declaration is made:*RABV 57.2*

“Any thought that Catholicism had any influence over the King James Bible must be banished not only upon remembering the circumstances of its birth but also by the plea from its translators to King James for protection from a papish retaliation” (Page 98.)*RABV 57.3*

In view of this statement it seems proper in addition to what has

been given on previous pages, to quote more testimony bearing upon this whole question. The following statement is found in "Some Criticisms of the Text of the New Testament," by George Salmon, D. D., who was himself a scholarly critic of the work of the Revisers:*RABV 57.4*

"With one exception, to be presently mentioned, Hort never follows merely Western authority, so that his may be pronounced to be a thoroughly Protestant New Testament, the fact that a reading is Roman being regarded as enough to condemn it."—Pages 86, 87.*RABV 57.5*

The Greek text of Westcott and Hort was not adopted by the Revisers, who exercised their own judgment as to the text they would translate, but it is doubtless true that these two men, on account of their recognized scholarship, did have a strong influence in determining both the Greek text finally agreed upon and the translation of that text.*RABV 57.6*

As to the influence of the Rheims translation over the A. V. at the time of its birth, the following quotations are of interest:*RABV 58.1*

Influence of Rheims H. T. on AV.—"In *verse 22 (Luke 16:19-31)* the pleasantly quaint but archaic 'yt fortunéd,' after holding its ground in one or two of the older versions, is conveniently changed into the more natural translation by the last revisers (of 1611), who probably took it from the Rhemish version, to which it is certain that they were from time to time indebted, though it was not one of the versions to which they were especially directed to refer."—"The Revision of the New Testament," Lightfoot, Trench, and Ellicott," p. 61 of Ellicott's portion.*RABV 58.2*

"As a contribution to the interpretation of the Scripture it (the Rheims and Douai Bible, (1582-1609) is practically valueless; but, on the other hand, its systematic use of words and technical phrases taken directly from the Latin has had a considerable influence on our Authorized Version. Many of the words derived from the Latin which occur in our Bible were incorporated into it from the Rheims New Testament."—"Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts," by Frederic G. Kenyon, H. N., Librarian of British Museum, p. 229.*RABV 58.3*

“The beginning of *verse 15 (2 Thessalonians 2)* brings out a polemical difference. The A.V., with really considerable boldness, here follows the Rhemish Version in opposition to all the earlier versions.... The authorities on which the revisers (of 1611) seem mainly to have relied (as their guide in translating the Greek text) are Beza’s Latin Version and notes, the Genevan, and the Rhemish Version. To this last version, though it was not in the list of their authorities, they were certainly more than occasionally indebted and commonly with advantage; as the Rhemish, with all its faults and asperities, was a translation of a really good version, and, at any rate, is very affluent in its vocabulary, and very useful in converting Latin words into English service.”—“The Revision of the English Version of the New Testament,” Lightfoot, Trench, and Ellicott, pp. 70, 81.*RABV 58.4*

“If, however, there was an anti-Romish bias at work in these passages (previously quoted) let it be again remembered to the credit of the Translators (of 1611), (1.) that they removed many renderings which were known to give offence to Romanists, such as the word ‘images’ for ‘idols’ in *2 Corinthians 6:16*; *Ephesians 5:5*; *1 John 5:21*; and (2.) that in the case of renderings to which Romanists had objected, they put an end to all cavil by adopting the renderings of the Rhemish Version. In this way they freely admitted such terms as ‘ordained,’ *Acts 14:23* (omitting ‘by election’); ‘confess,’ in *James 5:16*; ‘tradition,’ in *2 Thessalonians 2:15*; ‘regeneration,’ in *Titus 3:5*, and ‘church’ in *Hebrews 12:23*.”—“The Expositor,” Volume III, pp. 300, 301, Second Series, F. W. Farrar.*RABV 58.5*

“More than half of these marginal references in the A.V. (edition of 1611) are derived from the Latin Vulgate, and preserve for us the fruits of the researches of medieval scholars and the traditional expositions of the Western Church.”—“How to Understand the Bible,” Martin Anstey, p. 106.*RABV 58.6*

As to the plea of the AV translators to King James for “protection from a papish retaliation,” on which the author quotes part of a sentence from the AV preface, only this needs to be said:*RABV 59.1*

Plea for royal protection.—The author then quotes part of a sentence in the AV preface. If he had quoted the entire sentence it would be clearly seen that the translators made just such a plea also to protect them from being “maligned by self-conceited Brethren (Protestant) who run their own ways, and give liking unto nothing, but what is framed by themselves, and hammered on their anvil.” This is a fair sample of more than one of the author’s quotations where he leaves out one side in question, and includes only a part of the sentence or paragraph that suits his one-sided argument.*RABV 59.2*

For further facts on Catholic influence over Erasmus’ “pure Greek text” as mother to the Received Text and the Authorized Version, see pages 5-7, Section II, of this review.*RABV 59.3*

Changes in the Authorized Version

On page 69 of the author's book is found the following paragraph:*RABV 59.4*

"The Rheims-Douay and the King James Version were published less than thirty years apart. Since then the King James has steadily held its own. The Rheims-Douay has been repeatedly changed to approximate the King James. So that the Douay of 1600 and that of 1900 are not the same in many ways."*RABV 59.5*

The plain inference intended to be drawn from this paragraph is that while the Roman Catholic Version needed to be changed from time to time, the King James Version was perfect from the first and needed no changes to be made. The evidence contained in the following quotations will show that this implied inference is entirely contrary to truth.*RABV 59.6*

Many early changes made in AV.—"The first edition of the 'Authorized Version' appeared in 1611. In 1614 another edition was printed which contained more than 400 variations from the first. But the sharp criticisms that were hurled at the new version, largely by Hugh Broughton, whose irascible disposition had deprived him of a place, as his scholarship deserved, on the translation committee, forced a revision in 1629. The so-called final revision of the Authorized Version was printed in 1638. Within less than fifty years after the appearance of King James Version, agitation was begun for a new revision of the Bible. In 1653 the Long Parliament submitted a bill calling for such revision. The reasons that lay back of the bill were in part errors, mainly printers', and some in translation, and also the so-called prelatical language of the version. The matter went so far as to be put into the hands of a committee appointed especially to take charge of the scheme. Some preliminary work was begun, but the dissolution of Parliament put an end to the proposed concerted action."—"The Ancestry of Our English Bible," by Ira Maurice Price, Ph. D., p. 280.*RABV 59.7*

Many later changes made without authority.—"Most readers will be aware that numberless and not inconsiderable departures from the original or standard edition of the Authorized Translation as

published in 1611, are to be found in the modern Bibles which issue from the press by thousands every year. Some of these differences must be imputed to oversight and negligence, from which no work of man can be entirely free; but much the greater part of them are deliberate changes, introduced silently and without authority by men whose very names are often unknown. Now, if such alterations had been made invariably for the worse, it would have been easy in future editions to recall the primitive readings, and utterly to reject the later corruptions. This, however, is far from being the case. Not a few of these variations, especially those first met with in Cambridge folio Bibles dated 1629 and 1638, which must have been superintended with much critical care, amend manifest faults of the original Translators or editors, so that it would be most injudicious to remove them from the place they have deservedly held in all our copies for the last 250 years.”—“The Authorized Edition of the English Bible,” 1884, F. H. A. Scrivener, p. 3.*RABV*
60.1

MSS Available in 1611 and Now

In the effort to show that the material available for the early translations of the Bible were practically as good as the more abundant material available in later times, the following quotation is found on page 78 of the author's book: "On the whole the difference in the matter of the sources available in 390, 1590, 1890 are not very serious." On page 81 he says; "The problems presented by these two manuscripts (Vatican and Sinai) were well known, not only to the translators of the King James, but also to Erasmus. Erasmus, however, rejected these varying readings of the Vatican manuscript because he considered from the massive evidence of his day that the Received Text was correct."*RABV 60.2*

These statements are all entirely unwarranted, as is shown by the following testimony taken from many of the same general character:*RABV 61.1*

1611 MSS of late date and few in number.—"With regard to the Greek Text (used in 1611), it would appear that, if to some extent the Translators exercised an independent judgment, it was mainly in choosing amongst readings contained in the principal editions of the Greek Text that had appeared in the sixteenth century. Wherever they seem to have followed a reading which is not found in any of those editions, their rendering may probably be traced to the Latin Vulgate. Their chief guides appear to have been the later editions of Stephanus and Beza, and also, to a certain extent, the Complutensian (Catholic) Polyglot. All these were founded for the most part on manuscripts of late date, few in number, and used with little critical skill. But in those days it could hardly have been otherwise. Nearly all the more ancient of the documentary authorities have become known only within the last two centuries; some of the most important of them, indeed, within the last few years. Their publication has called forth not only improved editions of the Greek Text, but a succession of instructive discussions on the variations which have been brought to light, and on the best modes of distinguishing original readings from changes introduced in the course of transcription. While therefore it has long been the opinion of all scholars that the commonly received text needed thorough revision, it is but recently that materials have been

acquired for executing such a work with even approximate completeness.”—The Parallel New Testament, Greek and English, Revisers’ Preface, pp. vii, viii.*RABV 61.2*

About 25 MSS in 1611 versus 3000 now.—“The TR (Textus Receptus) is consequently derived from (at most) some 20 or 25 MSS, dating from the last few centuries before the invention of printing, and not selected on any estimate of merit, but merely as being ready to the editor’s hands. They may be taken as fairly representative of the great mass of Gr. Test MSS of the late Middle Ages, but no more. At the present time we have over 3000 Greek MSS of the NT, or of parts of it, and they range back in age to the 4th cent., or even, in the case of a few small fragments, to the 3rd. The history of Textual Criticism during the past two centuries and a half has been the history of the accumulation of all this material (and of the further masses of evidence provided by ancient translations), and of its application to the discovery of the true text of the NT; and it is not surprising that such huge successions of evidence, going back in age a thousand years or more behind the date of Erasmus’ principal witnesses, should have necessitated a considerable number of alterations in the details of the TR.”—Dictionary of the Bible, Edited by James Hastings, D. D., p. 916.*RABV 61.3*

Now over 4000 Greek MSS besides other ancient evidence.—“The literary evidence to the text of the NT is vastly more abundant than that to any other series of writings of like compass in the entire range of ancient letters. Of the sacred books of the Heb. Bible there is no known copy antedating the 10th cent. A. D. Of Homer there is no complete copy earlier than the 13th cent. Of Herodotus there is no NS earlier than the 10th cent. Of Vergil but one copy is earlier than the 4th cent., and but a fragment of all Cicero’s writings is even as old as this, of the NT, however, we have two splendid MSS of the 4th cent., (Sinaiticus and Vaticanus) at least ten of the 5th, twenty-five of the 6th and in all a total of more than four thousand copies in whole*RABV 61.4*

or in part of the Gr NT. To these copies of the text itself may be added the very important and even more ancient evidence of the VSS of the NT in the Lat, Syr, and Egyp tongues, and the

quotations and clear references to the NT readings found in the words of the early Church Fathers, as well as the inscriptions and monumental data in Syria, Asia Minor, Africa, Italy, and Greece, dating from the very age of the apostles and their immediate successors. It thus appears that the documents of the Christian faith are both so many and so widely scattered that these very facts more than any others have embarrassed the final determination of the text. Now, however, the science of textual criticism has so far advanced and the textual problems of the Gr Testament have been so well traversed that one may read the Christian writings with an assurance approximating certainty,”—Charles Fremont Sitterly in “The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, “Vol. 5, p. 2950.*RABV 61.5*

Latest Inventory.—“The last inventory of NT MSS (that of von Soden) contains 1716 copies of the Gospels, 531 of Acts, 628 of Pauline Epp., and 219 of Apoc.; and of this total, as stated above, less than 160 are uncials.”—*RABV 61.6*

Dictionary of the Bible, Edited by James Hastings, D. D., p. 918.*RABV 61.7*

Science of textual criticism sprung up since 1611.—“He (the reader) will have seen also (to recapitulate here for greater clearness)—(1.) that in the present day we have access to a treasury of ancient manuscripts, versions, and quotations such as the scholars of King James’s day had never dreamed of; (2.) that the science of textual criticism, which teaches the value and the best methods of dealing with these documents, has entirely sprung up since; (3.) that our scholars are better acquainted with the Sacred languages, and able to distinguish delicate shades of meaning which were quite lost on their predecessors; and (4.) lastly, that owing to the natural growth of the English language itself many words in the Authorized Version have become obsolete, and several have completely changed their meaning during the past 300 years.”—“How We Got Our Bible,” J. Paterson Smyth, LL. B., B. D., pp. 112, 113.*RABV 61.8*

Where then is the “massive evidence” of Erasmus’ day that led him to “consider that the Received Text was correct,” as set over against the thousands of much later date?*RABV 61.9*

Section III: Review of the Scripture Texts Cited in Chapters Six, Eleven and Twelve

The aim of this book all the way through is to show that the English and American Revised Versions, especially the latter, are manipulated, unreliable translations—the product of deliberate, persistent purpose to render the text of the Scriptures in such a way as to fortify certain theological views of the translators. To this end, attempt is made also to show that the King James Authorized Version is an inerrant, perfect translation of the only genuine, flawless Greek text that has come down to us—the Textus Receptus. The acid test of the author's contention does not lie in the historical background of men and means that had to do with original texts and translations through the centuries, nor with the theological views held by translators of the King James and the Revised Versions, nor yet with any man's interpretations or comments on the language of a given translation, but the test does lie in whether or not the translation itself does violence or justice to the reading of the best authenticated original texts that the widest research, scholarship, and sympathetic devotion to the Scriptures have been able to produce. We may therefore proceed directly to the consideration of the texts cited in evidence of the author's contention, as found mostly in Chapters VI, XI, and XII of his book.*RABV 63.1*

Before taking up these texts individually and in order, however, we give a number of typical examples of how the author deals with the texts he cites. This is done for the benefit of any who do not desire to follow through the examination of all the texts but yet desire to know something of the author's methods.*RABV 63.2*

At the close of Chapter XII also, is given a summary of findings in review of the texts, which together with the typical examples given in this introduction will serve to give the reader a general idea of how the author handles his problem. It should be said, however, that no one can get the full significance of his methods without following this review right through text by text.*RABV 63.3*

Here are some of the methods followed, with typical examples cited

by reference to examination itself beginning on page 4 of this section.*RABV 64.1*

Ignoring the context.—In numerous instances of criticism, no regard is paid to the context, often in even the same verse, which completely nullifies the criticism. Examples are found in the pages following, marginally marked as follows: 92—III, 94—VI, 95—VII, 97—XVI, 206—II—1, 207—V—1.*RABV 64.2*

Disregarding parallel texts.—Criticism is frequently made on a particular text when numerous other scriptures in the same version supply what textual reasons oblige the translator to omit in the passage criticised. Examples are: 93—IV, 93—V, 96—XII, 96—XIII, 190—IV—2, 191—V—1, 202—XII—1b, 207—IV—1, 222—XII—1.*RABV 64.3*

Alternative readings in margin.—Not infrequently the translators find MS authority on a given passage somewhat divided, and must exercise their best judgment on which reading to give the preference in the text. In such instances, in order to be fair to the Bible student, the alternative reading is given in the margin. The author's criticism of such a passage almost invariably ignores the alternative reading as if none were there, or treats a mere marginal note as if it were an alternative reading. Examples are: 181—I—1, 185—I—2, 202—XII-1b, 202—XII—1d, 202—XII—1i.*RABV 64.4*

Criticizing the marginal reading.—One of the author's unfairest methods is to substitute a marginal reading in the text, then criticise the text as if that were the translators preferred reading. Examples are 95—IX, 192—VI—1, 202—XII—1, 202—XII—1c, 204—I—1, 213—IX—1.*RABV 64.5*

Criticising the literal reading.—Whether the literal meaning of a word or phrase is given in the margin, or whether it is used in the text of a passage while elsewhere appearing in the margin, the author criticises the translators*RABV 64.6*

[Review Sec. III. Ch. 6, p. 3]for placing the literal anywhere if it differs from the AV reading. Examples are: 186—II—1, 187—III—1, 189—IV—1, 194—IX—1, 195—IX—2, 196—IX—4, 209—VII—1, 212—VII—4.*RABV 64.7*

Disregarding Greek forms.—Strange to say, some of the author's severest criticisms either ignore or defy the literal reading of the Greek forms of words, the criticism being based on the mere feet that the reading differs from the AV. Examples are: 185—I—2, 195—IX—3, 197—IX—6, 215—X—1, 216—XI—1, 220—XI—2.*RABV 65.1*

Disregarding Greek MSS.—Apparently the author has presumed to criticise ARV translations in entire disregard of the testimony of the MSS—any further than his contention that the Textus Receptus is a “pure Greek text,” and any MS which differs from that is manipulated or spurious. Examples are: 202—XII—1c, 202—XII—1e, 206—III—1, 210—VII—2, 212—VII—3.*RABV 65.2*

Looseness of reasoning or assertion.—Far-fetched inferences from any change from AV reading, aid loose assertions without any real proof, are not difficult to find. Examples are: 98—XVII, 194—VIII—2, 198—X—1, 199—XI—1, 200—XI—2, 202—XII—1g.*RABV 65.3*

Quotations from questionable sources and of questionable kind.—It is not uncommon to find quotations drawn from some Catholic, Unitarian, or Gnostic source, or some Protestant with & faulty theology, to bolster up the author's criticism or strained interpretation of a change in the reading of a scripture passage: Examples are: 184—I—1, 185—I—2, 202—XII—1f, 208—VI—1.*RABV 65.4*

Before starting on chapter VI, one passage dealt with in the author's typical style on page 1 of the book, should be noticed.*RABV 65.5*

In the opening paragraphs the claim is made that the ARV in its translation of *2 Samuel 21:19* declares that Elhanan killed Goliath. A comparison between the AV and the ARV will show that the AV supplied certain words, as shown by their being printed in italics, and that therefore the AV made the passage read as the Committee thought it ought to read, while the ARV Committee translated the same*RABV 65.6*

[Review Sec. III Ch. 6, p. 4]Hebrew text without supplying any words. At the same time, in the margin, they call attention to the fact that in *1 Chronicles 20:5* the Hebrew text reads “Elhanan slew Lahmi the brother of Goliath.” These facts are not stated in the

book, but the question is raised, “Is the American Revised Version correct on this point, or is the Bible, which has led the Protestant world for three hundred years, correct?” Is this a fair and unprejudiced dealing with this passage?*RABV 65.7*

CHAPTER VI. “Comparisons to Show How the Jesuit Bible Reappears in the ARV”

Pages Reference 91—*IRABV 66.1*

Matthew 6:13. On abbreviation of the Lord’s Prayer.*RABV 66.2*

ARV omits “For thine is the kingdom and power and glory, forever. Amen.” The author calls this twice, a mutilation of the Lord’s Prayer, stating that the Reformers protested against it, but that the Jesuits and the Revisers accepted it. The textual facts are that the omitted part is not found in the oldest Greek MSS, but since it is found in many of the later ones, the ARV places this note in the margin: “Many authorities, some ancient, but with variation add ‘For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory, forever. Amen,’” which reading is exactly as it appears in AV. No one seeking to mutilate a passage would be as fair as this. Moreover the part omitted is in the nature of a doxology, and affects no doctrine, The two following quotations taken from conservative authors are to the point:*RABV 66.3*

“*Matthew 6:13.* A liturgical ending, no part of the original prayer.”—The Expositor’s Greek Testament,” Vol. I, p. 122.*RABV 66.4*

“It is right to say that I can no longer regard this doxology (*Matthew 6:13*) as certainly an integral part of St. Matthew’s Gospel; but (notwithstanding its rejection of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort) I am not yet absolutely convinced of its spuriousness*RABV 66.5*

[Review Sec. III Ch. 6, p. 5]*RABV 66.6*

“It is probable that the doxology was interpolated from the Liturgies, and the variation of reading renders this all the more likely; it is just as probable that it was cast out of St. Matthew’s Gospel to bring it into harmony with St. Luke’s*RABV 67.1*

“It is vain to dissemble the pressure of the adverse case, though it ought not to be looked upon as conclusive.”—“A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament,” Frederick Henry Ambrose Scrivener, Vol. II, pp. 323, 324, 325.*RABV 67.2*

Matthew 5:44. On praying for enemies. *RABV* 67.4

ARV omits the middle part of this verse reading, “bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and also which despitefully use you.” On the strength of this one omission the author declares “that the Revised Version is not a revision in any sense whatever, but a new Bible based on different manuscripts from the KJ, on Catholic manuscripts in fact.” *RABV* 67.5

Two facts should be pointed out in this connection. First, that the two MSS Aleph and B, that is, the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus respectively, are the two oldest MSS among all that have been collected by scholars over the centuries, from the time of Erasmus at the beginning of the 16th century down to the latest discoveries. They are dated by all scholars back as early as the 4th century, while no other MS that is in the nature of anything more than a few fragments is dated earlier than the 5th century. Those of importance dating back to the 5th century are the Alexandrian and some fragments at Paris, while one, the Codex Beza, is of the 5th to the 6th century. *RABV* 67.6

It is a sweeping charge that the ARV is not a revision, but a new Bible, because its translators are guided by the oldest and most complete MSS, the two oldest of which have been made available since the AV was issued. Because these two oldest MSS came to us directly from Catholic sources, the author calls any version that is influenced by these MSS “a Catholic version.” He neglects to state that Erasmus, who prepared the text which the author calls “the pure Greek text” was himself a Catholic, that his work on the Greek text was dedicated to Pope Leo X and received the written endorsement of the Pope, *RABV* 67.7

[Review Sec. III Ch. 6, p. 6]and that in one of his editions of the text, Erasmus printed both the Pope’s letter of endorsement and in parallel columns the official Roman Catholic text in Latin, the Vulgate of Jerome. There is no historical proof that any Greek text was more directly influenced by Catholic hands, a Catholic version, and Catholic approval than was that of Erasmus, yet the text of Erasmus was the basis of what has since been called the Textus

Receptus, which the author lauds so highly as a pure, uncorrupted text. There is no direct proof that either the Vaticanus or Sinaiticus was handled in any such way as was the text of Erasmus, which brought us the Textus Receptus. It is not fair therefore to charge a version with being Catholic because it is influenced by the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus unless one is willing to call the AV a Catholic version also because it was based upon a text approved by the Pope.*RABV 67.8*

Moreover, the ARV shows its fidelity to authenticated texts and its freedom from the charge of mutilation, in the fact that the very parts omitted in *Matthew 5:44* are all retained in ARV in *Luke 6:27, 28*. When these omissions, which according to the author constitute the Revised Version a new Bible, are fully retained in a parallel passage, where is the consistency in making such a charge?*RABV 68.1*

92—III*RABV 68.2*

Luke 2:33. On Joseph's being father of Jesus.*RABV 68.3*

The charge here is that the Jesuits and the AR "give Jesus a human father or at least failed to make the distinction" by changing the Joseph of AV to His father in ARV. Whatever charge may be brought on the corrupting of this text, the fact remains that in *verse 48* of the same chapter, Mary definitely calls Joseph the father of Jesus in the phrase "Thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing," while in *verses 27 and 41* Joseph and Mary are called His "parents" in both AV and ARV. If any one tried to mutilate this passage, he fell far short by failing to mutilate these other three verses. The fact*RABV 68.4*

[Review Sec. III, Ch. 6, p. 7]that the three verses read as they do frees the Revisers from any such charge. Moreover, the word Joseph appears only in the Alexandrian and some later secondary MSS, while the other major copies read "His father."*RABV 68.5*

93—IV*RABV 69.1*

Luke 4:8. On get thee behind me Satan.*RABV 69.2*

ARV omits the clause “Get thee behind me Satan” in this passage, and because the Douay does the same the author finds a “fatal parallel between the Jesuit and the Revised Versions”, and says that “we were revised backwards.” The reason he gives is that “The papal corrupters of the MSS did not wish Peter and Satan to stand on the same basis.” Two facts should be noted. The first is that the testimony of the MSS is so positively against including this omitted clause in this verse that no notation is made of any exception to its omission, with the one exception that one editor cites it as occurring in the Alexandrian. The omission of the clause “Get thee behind me Satan” for textual reasons in *Luke 4:8* is fully compensated for in Matthew. The ARV reads in *Matthew 4:10*, addressed to Satan: “Get thee hence, Satan.” and in *Matthew 16:23*: “Get thee behind me, Satan.” The only difference in the two Greek texts lies in the two words, “behind me,” and could in no sense affect the doctrine, or make any appreciable difference in the meaning as applied to Satan directly, or to Satan through Peter.*RABV 69.3*

93—*VRABV 69.4*

Luke 11:2-4. On the Lord’s Prayer in Luke.*RABV 69.5*

The author’s only comment here is that again “The Jesuit Version and the American Revised agree,” and that is sufficient for him to reject the Revised regardless of whether or not it agrees with the best attested MSS. The parts of this secondary record of the Lord’s Prayer, to whose omission the author objects, are “which art in heaven” after the word Father, and “Thy will be done as in heaven so in earth,” and “but deliver us from evil.” All the parts of the Lord’s Prayer omitted here in ARV are given in the margin as variant readings in the MSS, and they are also included in the text in the *RABV 69.6*

[Review Sec. III, Ch. 6, p. 8]ARV of this prayer in Matthew. If omitting the phrase “which art in heaven,” opens the way for us to pray to any man-made god, as the author declares on page 201, what shall we say about the form of address used by Jesus Himself several times in *John 17*, and also on the Cross? Moreover, ARV gives a cross reference to *Matthew 6:9* where the phrase “who art in heaven,” is retained.*RABV 69.7*

Acts 13:42. On the Sabbath of the Jews. RABV 70.2

In this text ARV omits two phrases, “the Jews”, and “the Gentiles.” The author objects to this, and says that in the AV reading “it is clear that the Sabbath was the day on which the Jews worshipped” while he evidently does not think it clear in the ARV reading; whereas if he had looked back to *verses 14, 15*, and forward to *verse 43*, he would have found that the context of this scripture makes it perfectly clear that the Jews and Gentiles worshipped in a synagogue of the Jews on the Sabbath day. The request to meet the next Sabbath can refer to nothing else but the same synagogue of the Jews. Definite mention of the Jews and Gentiles in *verse 42* is found only in the Received Text and three secondary MSS. How could any discord be created or any fundamental doctrine affected by omitting the repetition of the words Jews and Gentiles in this verse when the context makes it all clear? If there is any embarrassment to us on this verse, it is found in the AV marginal reading “in the week between” or “in the Sabbath between,” which ARV removes. *RABV 70.3*

Acts 15:23. On the clergy and the laity. RABV 70.5

In this passage the author objects to the omission of the little word and between elders and brethren as found in the Revised, and bids us notice that the “clergy is set off from the laity.” First of all, three major MSS besides Vaticanus and Sinaiticus read the same as ARV has rendered it, that is, without the and, while one later editing of Sinaiticus includes and. That this matter is a pointless one is clear from two facts, (1) That according to *RABV 70.6*

[Review Sec. III. Ch. 6, p. 9] *verse 2* the messengers from Antioch were appointed to go up to Jerusalem “unto the apostles and elders about this question”—not to them and the laity. (2) That nevertheless the decision to send messengers back to Antioch is mentioned definitely in *verse 22* as made by “the apostles and the elders, with the whole church, to choose men.” Evidently the whole church authorized the apostles and elders to send the messengers,

if not to write and send the communication. This is a thing that happens in every democratic church organization, including the Seventh-day Adventist. How often do our own officers and elders send out messages to the church scattered abroad, that have been authorized in some conference, or council, or church assembly? Yet no one presumes that they are separating the clergy from the laity.*RABV 70.7*

95—VIII*RABV 71.1*

Acts 16:7. On the Spirit of Jesus. RABV 71.2

Here the author criticises the addition of the phrase “of Jesus” to the word “Spirit” as is done in ARV, and interprets it as implying “that the Holy Spirit had so taken possession of the Person of the Exalted Jesus that He could be spoken of as ‘the Spirit of Jesus,’” quoting this sentiment from Milligan, who the author says echoed the theology of the Revisers. It is strange that the author should accept such an interpretation, for the phrase “Spirit of Jesus” is in full harmony with equivalent passages in *Romans 8:9*; *Galatians 4:6*; *2 Corinthians 3:17*, and elsewhere. Incidentally, the phrase “of Jesus” is found in 9 other MSS besides Vaticanus and Sinaiticus.*RABV 71.3*

95—IX*RABV 71.4*

Romans 5:1. On we have or let us have peace. RABV 71.5

This passage is one of quite a number in which the author not very commendably substitutes in the text a reading from the marginal note, and then criticises the result as if it were the original reading preferred by the Revisers. As a matter of fact the ARV text says we have, with a marginal note, “many ancient authorities read let us have.” Observe here that the author criticises an informing note as if it were in the text. The difference in the *RABV 71.6*

[Review Sec. III, Ch. 6, p. 10]Greek text between the two renderings is only between the simple o (short) and compound o (long). Either rendering of the phrase is entirely orthodox. We frequently exhort ourselves to lay hold of what is available.*RABV 71.7*

95—XRABV 72.1

1 Corinthians 5:7. On omission of the phrase for us.*RABV 72.2*

The criticism here is on omitting the phrase “for us” from the passage “For Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us,” which omission by ARV the author says “strikes at the doctrine of the atonement.” The rage of a certain Reverend Sir, and of a Unitarian minister, has no bearing on the meaning of this passage as translated in either AV or ARV. Moreover, six other MSS besides Vaticanus and Sinaiticus omit the phrase “for us.” In both AV and ARV renderings occurs the phrase our Passover, identifying it in each case with Christ. If Christ our Passover was sacrificed, for whom could He have been sacrificed, except for us? Moreover, other scriptures, like *Romans 5:8*, *1 Peter 1:17-21*, definitely state in both ARV and AV that Christ died for us. How could the author declare that by taking out the phrase for us in this verse “there is no gospel left,” when no primary MS contains it, and when ARV retains it in other passages where the MSS justify it?*RABV 72.3*

95—XIRABV 72.4

1 Corinthians 15:47. On omission of the Lord.*RABV 72.5*

In this verse the phrase the Lord is omitted in ARV. To this the author objects because it does not tell specifically who the man from heaven is, as does the AV. Six other MSS besides Vaticanus and Sinaiticus omit the phrase, the Lord. The use of the phrase in this verse is not vital to understanding who is meant, since the context and the declaration in this verse that the second man is “of heaven” make it sufficiently clear who the second Adam is.*RABV 72.6*

96—XIIRABV 72.7

Ephesians 3:9. On omission of the phrase, “by Jesus Christ.”*RABV 72.8*

Because the phrase “by Jesus Christ” is omitted here, the author thinks that a blow is struck at the great truth that Jesus is Creator. As a matter of fact only three amended Greek texts contain the

phrase “by Jesus Christ”*RABV 72.9*

[Review Sec. III, Ch. 6, p. 11]in this verse. That all things were created by Christ is clearly stated in ARV in *John 1:1-3*; *Colossians 1:16*; and *Hebrews 1:2*, which invalidates the criticism on its omission here for ulterior purposes.*RABV 72.10*

96—XIII*RABV 73.1*

Colossians 1:14. On omission of the phrase, his blood.*RABV 73.2*

In the omission of this phrase in ARV the author again sees a “fatal parallel between the Jesuit Version and the American Revised Version.... in full accord with modern liberalism” and says that it “strikes at the very heart of the gospel.” If the author is to be guided by the parallelism between the Douay Version and the ARV and conclude that because the two agree therefore the ARV is influenced by the Jesuit Version, he would have to reject most of the New Testament. On the other hand, if we were dependent upon this single passage for the information that our redemption was obtained “through His blood,” the omission would indeed be serious, but the fact that it is included in many other scriptures in ARV such as *1 Peter 1:17-19*; *1 John 1:7*; *Acts 20:28*, prevents any difficulty whatever. In *Ephesians 1:7*, ARV uses almost exactly the same language as the AV uses here. As to the testimony of the MSS, only three secondary texts include the phrase in *Colossians 1:14*; while all of the major MSS and a considerable number of secondary ones omit the phrase in this particular passage. In the face of such testimony what should a translator do but follow the best attested reading, and why should the Revisers be charged with modernism for omitting it?*RABV 73.3*

97—XIV*RABV 73.4*

1 Timothy 3:16. On substitution of he who for God.*RABV 73.5*

In this passage ARV reads “he who was manifested in the flesh” instead of “God was manifest in the flesh” as in AV. The author says that this change destroys the teaching of the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, since “‘He who’ might have been an angel or even a good man like Elijah,” as if Elijah or any other good man was

ever preached unto the Gentiles as a means of salvation or ever exemplified the mystery of godliness by an incarnation that *RABV 73.6*

[Review Sec. III, Ch. 6, p. 12] was efficacious for salvation! Altogether apart from this verse, the identity of Christ as our divine Saviour is made plain in numerous other scriptures such as *John 1:14* 1 *John 1:2, 3*; *Philippians 2:6-8*. On the reading of the MSS it may be stated that the two words for God and for he who are sufficiently similar in the Greek so that any hand-copyist might easily mis-copy one for the other, but nothing can be said to be essentially lost whichever reading is followed. On the textual authority, Dr. Scrivener, who is often cited by the author as an eminent scholar, bears the following testimony: *RABV 73.7*

1 *Timothy 3:16*: “Codex A [the Alexandrian manuscript], however, I have examined at least twenty times within as many years, and yet am not quite able to assent to the conclusion of Mr. Cowper when he says ‘we hope that no one will think it possible, either with or without a lens, to ascertain the truth of the matter by any inspection of the Codex’ (Cod. Alex., Introd. P. xviii). On the contrary, seeing (as every one must see for himself) with my own eyes, I have always felt convinced with Berriman and the earlier collators that Cod. A read [Theos, God] and, so far as I am shaken in my conviction at all, it is less by the adverse opinion even of Bp. Ellicott, than by the more recently discovered fact that OC [Hos, He who] (which is adopted by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Davidson, Tregelles, Alford, Ellicott, Wordsworth, Hort and Westcott), was read in Aleph [the Sinaitic manuscript] as early as the fourth century *RABV 74.1*

“On a review of the whole mass of external proof, bearing in mind too that OC (from which 8 of D* is an evident corruption) is grammatically much the harder reading after [musterion] (Canon I), and that it might easily pass into [Theos], we must consider it probable (indeed, if we were sure of the testimony of the first-rate uncials, we might regard it as certain) that the second of our rules of Comparative Criticism must here be applied, and [Theos] of the more recent many yield place to [Hos] of the ancient few.—“A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament,” Frederick

Henry Ambrose Scrivener, Vol. II, pages 391, 392.*RABV 74.2*

97—XV*RABV 74.3*

2 Timothy 4:1. On the judgment and appearing of Christ.*RABV 74.4*

The author's contention is that AV "fixes the great day of judgment as occurring at the time of His appearing and His kingdom," while "the Jesuit and Revised place it in the indefinite future." Strictly speaking, the judgment does not occur at the time of Christ's appearing, but before it. The rendering of the ARV is therefore more accurate in time and sequence than AV, and is justified by the reading of five principal and several secondary MSS. It may be added here, however, that the difference in the reading turns on whether the original word is *kai*, meaning *and*, or *kata*, meaning *at*. Four major MSS give *kai*. A later revision of two of these gives *kata*. If the author desires to place the time of the judgment strictly at Christ's second coming, it is well that "the time of the judgment is obliterated in this passage" (p. 203) as he declares.*RABV 74.5*

97—XVI*RABV 75.1*

Hebrews 7:21. On omitting "after the order of Melchisedec."*RABV 75.2*

Though ARV omits the phrase "after the order of Melchisedec" in this verse in the passage quoted from the Old Testament, it definitely includes it in *Hebrews 6:20*, and in *7:17*. It is also definitely implied in *Hebrews 7:15*.*RABV 75.3*

98—XVII*RABV 75.4*

Revelation 22:14. On the robes and the commandments.*RABV 75.5*

The testimony of the MSS is so strong against the genuineness of the clause "that do His commandments" in this verse, that no variant reading is cited in the margin of either ARV or ERV. This clause is found in only one Greek uncial of the tenth century at Rome. The Greek spelling of the two clauses in question is so much alike that we give the two, first in English, then in Greek:*RABV 75.6*

1. “that wash their robes.”*RABV 75.7*

2. “that do his commandments.”*RABV 75.8*

1. hoi plunontes tas stolas autoon.*RABV 75.9*

2. hoi poiountes tas entolas auton.*RABV 75.10*

Error in copying language so similar might account for the two readings. But either reading is orthodox and disturbs no doctrine. Our duty to keep the commandments is clearly stated many times elsewhere in the New Testament as well as in the Old. The theology of washing their robes as a preparation for access to the tree of life and entering in through the gates into the city, is entirely orthodox, as the figure is used also in *Revelation 7:14* in reference to a company of overcomers seen before the throne of God, of whom it is testified *RABV 75.11*

[Review Sec. III, Ch. 6, p. 14]that they “washed their robes” as a necessary condition of victory and access to heaven. It does not in any sense imply or hint that the washing of the robes takes place during the entrance into the city, as is so loosely argued by the author on page 198, for a purpose clause is sequential and future, not contemporaneous in meaning.*RABV 75.12*

CHAPTER XI “Blow After Blow Against The Truth”

Page Reference *RABV 77.1*

184—I—1 2 *Timothy 3:16*. On the inspiration of the Scriptures. *RABV 77.2*

This text involves no variance whatever in the MSS as they all read alike. The change made by ARV involves the transfer of the little verb *is* from one part of the sentence to another part, thus affecting the meaning of the general statement by making the verse read: “Every Scripture inspired of God is also profitable,” instead of “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God,” as it reads in AV. In the original Greek, the verb *is* is not expressed, as is recognized by its being put in italic in both AV and ARV. The meaning of the verse turns of course on where the *is* is inserted. Since no variant reading in original MSS is found, the place of inserting the *is* must be determined by the context and the judgment of the translator, in harmony with other scriptures, such as *2 Peter 1:19-21*; *1 Peter 1:9-12*; *Luke 1:70*, *Acts 1:16*. These scriptures justify the AV reading, but the ARV, while it prefers the reading of its own text, is fair in putting into the margin the exact reading of the AV as an alternative reading, thus leaving it to the reader to choose whichever reading he believes is in harmony with other scriptures. To one familiar with the *sprachgeist* of ancient and modern Greek, there is evidence in the Greek text itself that the AV reading is the correct one, yet with the judgment of the Revisers otherwise, it is hard to see how they could deal more fairly with the text than to give both readings to the Bible student. It might be added that this is one text in which we believe the judgment of the Revisers has gone wrong, but their going wrong will not deceive or waylay anyone because of their fairness in giving both readings. The quotation by the author from a Catholic Review, is far from true that Protestantism has been robbed of its only proof of Bible inspiration by what it calls “a correct rendering” of *2 Timothy 3:16*. Though this rendering by the Revisers is much to be regretted, it does not state an untruth but only part of the truth fully expressed elsewhere in the same version. See Howell’s “Gospel Keywords,” p. 84. *RABV 77.3*

185—I—2 *John 5:39*. On the searching of the Scriptures. *RABV*

The ARV reading changes the first word search, as a command, to the form ye search, as a declaration. There are no variant readings in any original MSS on this passage. The verb form of search is one of those rare instances in which the Greek does not distinguish between the imperative and indicative modes. No one can say, therefore, on the basis of the Greek word alone, whether or not it is to be translated search, or ye search. It makes no difference as far as our attitude toward studying the Scriptures is concerned. Considering the passage, however, from the viewpoint of the causal clause that immediately follows, there is no doubt that the ARV reading “Ye search the Scriptures because ye think that in them” is the correct one. See Howell’s “Key Words to the Gospel,” pp. 181-2. The point Jesus was making was obviously that the Jews search the Scriptures because they think they find eternal life in them, but these are the very Scriptures that testify that Jesus is the Messiah, and why should they not accept Him? How could this good improvement change any fundamental doctrine as the author charges? Again the quotation by the author from a Catholic Review states that by this change in the rendering “Protestantism has lost the very cause of its being.” What bearing does such an untruthful statement have upon the correct rendering of the text? The AV reading is inconsistent with itself.*RABV 78.2*

186—II—1 *John 2:11*. On the question of miracles.*RABV 79.1*

Here the author criticises ARV on two points. One is that of using the more literal English word sign in this and a few other scriptures instead of the AV rendering miracle, and also for placing the literal reading, sign, in the margin when miracle is used in the text.*RABV 79.2*

There are two different words rendering miracle in the New Testament. One is semeion, meaning sign, which is the base of signify, signification, and significance. The other is dynamis, which means power. In rendering the word semeion, neither AV nor ARV is uniform in using either sign or miracle, though AV renders it miracle more often. In 9 instances where ARV reads miracle in the text, it gives the Greek literal, either sign or power, as the case may

be, in the margin. In 22 uses of the word *semeion*, the ARV places the literal sign in the text. The author makes no mention of the fact that the AV puts sign in the text in 48 instances besides 31 where it uses miracle, and that many of these 48 have the meaning intended by miracle when it is used. In the 8 instances where the word *dynamis* is used, the ARV puts miracle in the text in 5 cases; in two, mighty work, and in one, power. In all instances, except the last, it puts the literal power in the margin. This shows that ARV was fair in putting in the margin the literal of whatever term is preferred in the text so that the reader may not be confused, but left to make his interpretation in the light of both the literal and the judgment of the translator. In such treatment there can be no “changed doctrines respecting miracles,” whatever the translators may personally believe about them, nor can they be justly charged with “systematic depravation of doctrine” by such fidelity to the Greek original.*RABV 79.3*

Here is an opinion on rendering the word *semeion* by a member of the 1611 Revision Committee:*RABV 80.1*

“It is to be regretted that *semeion* is not always rendered ‘sign’ in our Version; that in the Gospel of St. John, where it is of very frequent recurrence, ‘sign’ too often gives place to the vaguer ‘miracle’; and sometimes not without serious loss.”—“Synonyms of the New Testament,” Richard Chenevix Trench, D. D., pp. 330, 331.*RABV 80.2*

187—1 *Matthew 18:2, 3*. On conversion.*RABV 80.3*

The objection is made here by the author that the Revisers have changed the word convert into the very literal rendering turn, and thus introduces and exalts the “dangerous doctrine of salvation by our own effort.” He then quotes two writers as using this phrase in the Revised to claim that it explodes the popular error that men cannot convert themselves, but must be mere passive instruments in the hands of God to be converted by the Holy Spirit. But the author overlooks the fact that these same men could have found in the AV at least 9 times as many passages rendered with turn in the sense of conversion, and could have used these to bolster up their false doctrine that a man can convert himself. Here are the facts in

the case:*RABV 80.4*

Matthew 18:2, 3, is the one New Testament passage using the simple form of the word strepho, meaning turn, in the sense of conversion. The form here is passive, and should be rendered literally, be turned, or turn yourselves, according to whether the passive or the reflexive sense is allowed. In the AV this same simple verb form is rendered 14 times in the passive, 11 times in the active, and 3 times in the reflexive, but out of all these, the one instance in which this verb is used in the sense of conversion is the one under consideration.*RABV 80.5*

The regular word for convert in the New Testament is the compound form, epistrepho. This word is used 41 times in the New Testament, but only 17 of them in the sense of conversion. Of the 17 in the sense of conversion, the AV renders 8 with convert, and 9 with turn. The ARV renders the same 9 by turn, and also 5 out of the 8, leaving 3 times in which the ARV renders it convert. To sum up:*RABV 81.1*

AV renders the idea of convert by turn, 9 times.*RABV 81.2*

ARV renders the idea of convert by turn, 14 times.*RABV 81.3*

AV renders the idea of convert by convert, 8 times.*RABV 81.4*

ARV renders the idea of convert by convert, 3 times.*RABV 81.5*

It is true that the ARV confines the use of convert to the three times where it is used in the active or in the abstract, but AV also uses turn 9 times for convert without undermining the doctrine of conversion. In this connection it should be borne in mind that the basic idea in the Latin word convert is exactly the same as that in the Greek word epistrepho. The Latin root is vert, which one uses in words like invert, revert, subvert, as well as in convert, as also one uses strepho in strophe, catastrophe, and the like. In the light of all this can it be justly charged, as the author does, that the “Revisers changed the doctrine of conversion?”*RABV 81.6*

189—IV—1 *Hebrews 11:3*. On world for age.*RABV 81.7*

In this passage the author again injects the literal reading of the margin into the scripture text, and then criticises it. His charge is that by putting the literal word age or ages in either the text or the margin, the translators have “injected evolution into the Revised Version.” But let us study more carefully what the Revisers have actually done in comparison with the AV.*RABV 81.8*

In this passage ARV uses worlds in the text, the same as AV, but with the literal Greek ages in the margin. The Greek word, *aion*, meaning age, eon, is much used in the New Testament from Matthew to Revelation, a total of 122 times. In the Book of Hebrews, where this passage occurs, the word is used four times. In two of these, *Hebrews 1:2*, and *11:3*, AV and ARV agree in using world in the text, and ARV adds the literal age in the margin. In the other two, *6:5* and *9:26*, ARV uses age in the text. Thus in the Book of Hebrews ARV is fair in using either world or age, according as it seems to fit the meaning best, but in every instance makes it clear that the literal word is age. Throughout the Book of Revelation, where the word *aion* is used 27 times, AV and ARV agree in rendering it with some form of ever or forever in the text, while ARV adds the literal in the margin in each instance.*RABV 82.1*

In *Ephesians 2:7* and *Colossians 1:26*, AV and ARV agree on using ages in the text. In the Book of Matthew, where *aion* occurs 7 times, it is uniformly rendered by both AV and ARV with world in the text, but ARV adds the literal age in the margin. In the two Epistles to the Corinthians, where *aion* occurs 8 times, AV and ARV agree in using world in the text six times, ARV placing the literal age in the margin, while in one instance ARV permits age in the text, and in another, forevermore in the text. In 83 out of 122 times in the entire New Testament, AV translates *aion* with some other word than worlds, translating it worlds 38 times.*RABV 82.2*

This is amply sufficient to show that ARV uses no unfair discrimination in the rendering of this remarkable word *aion*, while seeking to make the reader intelligent in every instance on what the original word is. In our singing and preaching we are fond of speaking of the rolling of the eternal ages. This is very suggestive of what true evolution is. Doubtless we have much more to learn on the unfolding of the ages than we now know. See Howell’s “Gospel

Key Words,” pp. 67, 157.*RABV 83.1*

190-IV-2 *Colossians 1:15, 16*. On creation in Him, or by Him.*RABV 83.2*

By quoting from a Unitarian minister, the author seeks to make it appear that by changing the little word *by* in the AV to the little word *in* in ARV, the Revisers have limited creation to “a spiritual application to Christianity,” instead of its including the material creation. We admit that there is some difference between creation in Christ and creation by Christ. But as far as knowing who the creator was, there is no essential difference whether we say that all things were created in Him or by Him, for in both instances it must mean that He created all things, or that “all things have been created through Him,” as ARV expresses it in the last part of *verse 16*. That the “all things” referred to include the visible and material, is made very clear in the verse itself. On the question of ascertaining the identity of the Creator, there is no room for quibbling on the rendering with *by* or *in*, as there is no real difference between saying, as in this verse in the ARV, “in Him were all things created,” and saying in *Ephesians 2:10* in AV, “we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus.” Some man’s interpretation of the ARV rendering of *Colossians 1:15, 16* has no bearing upon its correct translation or true meaning, particularly if that interpreter is a Unitarian, who does not believe in the trinity at all.*RABV 83.3*

191-V-1 1 *Timothy 3:16*. On God or He who.*RABV 84.1*

See 97—XIV*RABV 84.2*

192-V-2 *Acts 16:7*. On the Spirit of Jesus.*RABV 84.3*

See 95—VIII*RABV 84.4*

192-VI-1 *Isaiah 7:14*. On virgin or maiden.*RABV 84.5*

Here again the author brings the marginal reading *maiden* into the text of ARV and makes it read: “Behold a maiden shall conceive and bear a son,” and then criticises this reading as giving room to doubt the virgin birth of Christ. ARV as well as AV uses *virgin* in the text, ARV adding the literal *maiden* in the margin. In the Old

Testament the literal Hebrew for the word virgin is unmarried female. The dictionary definition of the word maiden is a young unmarried woman. The Septuagint rendering of *Isaiah 7:14* is parthenos, generally understood in Greek, and defined in Thayer's Greek Lexicon, as a marriageable maiden, or a young unmarried woman. There is no doubt cast on the virgin birth by giving the literal word maiden in the margin.*RABV 84.6*

193-VII-1 *1 Corinthians 5:7*. On the Passover for us.*RABV 84.7*

See 95—*XRABV 84.8*

193-VIII-1 *Job 19:25, 26*. On the resurrection.*RABV 84.9*

In this passage ARV renders the last clause “without my flesh shall I see God” instead of “in my flesh shall I see God” as in AV. The author charges that the ARV rendering tends to “make the resurrection from the tomb only a spiritual event.” Let us examine this passage.*RABV 84.10*

The number of supplied words in the AV translation of this difficult passage indicates how hard it was for the translator to make its meaning clear. The Chairman of the ARV Revision Committee definitely states that in the translation of this passage the AV follows the Septuagint and Vulgate against the Hebrew, but that of course the Hebrew text must have the preference. Here are his words:*RABV 84.11*

“Then the Authorized Version follows the Septuagint and the Vulgate against the Hebrew (as in the important passage, *Job 19:26*), the Hebrew text must of course have the preference.”—“Introduction to the Revision of the English New Testament.” Philip Schaff, p. xxiv.*RABV 85.1*

Be that as it may in this passage, it is not difficult to understand from the ARV translation that Job's sustaining hope was that though his body of flesh might be destroyed in the grave, yet in spite of that fact he was sure to see God. Moreover, Paul says “Thou sowest not that body which shall be.” *1 Corinthians 15:37*. If this were the only passage we had on the resurrection of the body, we might be in a more difficult situation, but Paul's great discourse on the

resurrection in *1 Corinthians 15*, the bodily state of Adam and Eve before sin came in, and to which the righteous are to be restored, and other scriptural teachings, leave us in no doubt about what God's plan of resurrection and restoration is to include.*RABV 85.2*

194-VIII-2 *Acts 24:15*. On the question of the resurrection.*RABV 85.3*

In the ARV reading, the phrase “of the dead” is omitted for textual reasons. The author objects to this as making it easier to spiritualize away the resurrection. If there is to be a resurrection both of the “just and unjust,” as definitely stated in both AV and ARV, how could there possibly be a resurrection but of the dead? The point is not vital, for in 13 other instances ARV renders resurrection “of the dead” or “from the dead” exactly the same as AV.*RABV 85.4*

194-IX-1 *Matthew 24:3*. On the second coming of Christ.*RABV 86.1*

Here again the ARV reading is criticised on the basis of its giving in the margin the literal meaning of the phrase “end of the world,” while using in the text as the preferred rendering the exact language of the AV. When there is no variant reading in the MSS, and when the original actually says practically verbatim, if not quite literatim, “the consummation of the age,” how can the translator be true to his responsibility, and not let the student of Scripture know what the original really says?*RABV 86.2*

On the word coming, the texts of AV and ARV agree perfectly, but ARV puts the literal presence in the margin. Readers of the Greek have observed this wonderful word *parousia*, presence, many times, here and elsewhere, and been thrilled by its vividness in describing the return of Christ. All through His earthly life, Jesus was present in body and spirit with His disciples day and night. In His discourse in *John 14*, looking forward to his return, he declares, “I will come again, and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also”—a restoration of that marvellous presence with his children which the disciples had enjoyed. All this one would miss without knowing the literal of *parousia*. Why should the author so unfairly charge that the Revisers would “radically change the doctrine of the second coming of Christ?”*RABV 86.3*

195-IX-2 *Philippians 3:20, 21*. On our vile body.*RABV 86.4*

The familiar reading of AV “Who shall change our vile body” is changed to read in ARV, “Who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation.” By this the author declares that the change of the body “may occur at any time before His coming,” and “it may be a change from abstract vices to abstract virtues.” Here again the author ignores the reading of the Greek text. When there is no variant reading of the MSS, what is one to do when the original actually says “the body of our humiliation,” using two nouns to express it, but accept this reading instead of the phrase “vile body,” which uses only one noun and one adjective likely to convey a wrong impression in our modern parlance? The body is as really transformed in one rendering as the other, and how could it possibly mean “a change from abstract vices to abstract virtues?”*RABV 86.5*

195-IX-3 *2 Thessalonians 2:2*. On the day of Christ at hand or now present.*RABV 88.1*

Without any indication the author glides over the ARV reading to the English Revised and finds the phrase now present used instead of the phrase at hand, found in both AV and ARV, and strives to make a difference between the meaning of the two phrases. Let us look at the text itself. The Greek verb here rendered by AV at hand, and by ARV now present, is the very verb whose participle is used by Greek grammarians in designating the present tense, as distinguished from the past and future tenses. Other forms of the same verb are used in the AV in *Hebrews 9:9* in stating the time as then present, in *Romans 8:38* to designate things present, in *1 Corinthians 3:22*, again to denote things present, in *Galatians 1:14*, to describe the “present evil world.” What can be the harm, then, in rendering it present in *2 Thessalonians 2:2*? Moreover the Century Dictionary defines the phrase at hand as meaning, “within reach, nearby, present.”*RABV 88.2*

196-IX-4 *Titus 2:13*. On the glorious appearing.*RABV 88.3*

The author objects to changing the adjective glorious to the noun glory, but the original text in which there is no variance in the MSS, actually uses the noun where it occurs in the ARV translation. It is surely safe for us to accept the reading of the Scripture as it is

actually written, and incur no danger of making the coming of Christ appear to be a “manifestation among men of abstract virtues which may appear at any time and repeatedly in this present life,” as the author very illogically reasons concerning this change of reading to conform to the text as it reads.*RABV 88.4*

196-IX-5 *Revelation 1:7*. On wailing because of, or over Him.*RABV 89.1*

In this verse the ARV reading is that “all the tribes of the earth shall mourn over Him,” instead of “shall wail because of Him.” This is not a question of the textual reading, but of interpreting the Greek preposition *epi*, used with the accusative. We frequently use *over*, meaning *because of*. We mourn *over* a loss, or *over* a failure or *over* a defeat which will cause our heart sorrow, but with no thought whatever of the penitential in it. Because Westcott or some other man interprets *over* here to mean or make possible penitential sorrow, and universal salvation, is no reason for saying that the use of *over* is wrong. Besides that, there is no justification for such an interpretation in the light of the context and the other teachings of the Scripture. The same preposition is rendered *over* in 47 other places. Nevertheless we wish that the rendering *because of* had been retained as expressing a less equivocal meaning than *over*.*RABV 89.2*

197-IX-6 *Acts 3:19*. On times of refreshing.*RABV 89.3*

This passage is an outstanding example of the help to the Bible student in a more accurate rendering of the original language. The change of the time clause “When the times, etc.,” into a purpose clause, “so that the times, etc.”—is a more accurate rendering, as can be ascertained by comparing it with others in the New Testament, in both Greek and English. Moreover, in our interpretation of this passage, we have been accustomed to say, and say truthfully, that the blotting out of sin precedes the coming of Christ, and that the blotting out and the coming of Christ bring the times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord in their fullest sense, not denying that they do come in a degree at the time of repentance and forgiveness. That this interpretation and the ARV rendering are not only in agreement, but are justified by the reading

of the Greek is made clear by Dr. Robertson's testimony that the clause in question is a final, or purpose, not a temporal clause. Speaking of the general use of the conjunction that introduces this clause, he makes it plain that *hopos* retains its full force as a purpose clause in *Acts 3:19* and a few others:*RABV 89.4*

"*Hopos* no longer has an in final clauses save in the quotation from *Psalms 51:6* (*Psalms 50:4* in LXX), in *Romans 3:4* and three passages from Luke's writings (*Luke 2:35; Acts 3:19; 15:17* from Amos [so A, but B without an] *9:12*)"—A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Lights of Historical Research, A. T. Robertson, M. A., D. D., L. L. D., p. 986.*RABV 90.1*

Yet in the face of these fact the author uses a whole page of his book in quotations and comments in a vain effort to show by unfair deduction from the quotations, that the change of the time to the purpose clause has wrought havoc with the gospel, whereas, as shown above, it makes the passage harmonize with the teaching of the rest of the New Testament.*RABV 90.2*

198-X-1 *Revelation 22:14*. On the robes and commandments.*RABV 90.3*

See 98-XVII*RABV 90.4*

198-X-2 *Acts 13:42*. On the Sabbath of the Jews.*RABV 90.5*

See 94-VI*RABV 90.6*

[Review Sec. III, Ch. 11, p. 14]*RABV 90.7*

199-XI-1 *Mark 7:19*. On clean foods.*RABV 91.1*

In this passage the AV reading in this last phrase is purging all meats, while the ARV reads "This he said, making all meats clean," in which the phrase "This he said," is printed in italic to show that it is supplied. Leaving out the supplied words the two readings have exactly the same meaning, as any one will recognize that "purging" and "making clean" mean the same. By strange reasoning the author endeavors to make it appear that the Lord Jesus was here dealing with the distinction between animal meats that are clean or

unclean by nature as in the 11th Chapter of Leviticus. He makes two serious errors in his reasoning by again disregarding the Greek original. First, he makes the word meats appear to mean flesh food, whereas the original denotes foods in general, and makes no reference whatever to flesh as such. His second error is in overlooking the fact that Christ was here distinguishing between foods ceremonially or morally, the point being that there is no heart defilement in physical foods. His quotation from Milligan really has no bearing at all upon the point, with the sole exception that that little change in one Greek letter makes possible the connecting of the phrase “making all meats clean” directly with the Lord Jesus as speaker, instead of making it apply to his general statement on the course that natural food takes in the body. The difference again is between the simple Greek “o” and the compound long “o” of the Greek alphabet. Yet it has already been made clear that it makes no difference which way the reading runs, for the inference from the text must be the same in either case.*RABV 91.2*

200-XI-2 *Luke 23:44, 45*. On the darkening of the sun.*RABV 92.1*

In the description of the darkness at the crucifixion AV says, “And the sun was darkened,” while ARV says, “The sun’s light failing.” Because there is a difference in the wording, though one cannot see how there can be any difference in the meaning, the author objects to the changed wording in ARV because it differs from AV. He then brings in the reading from Moffatt’s translation, not found in the Revised Version, “owing to an eclipse of the sun,” and then criticises the Revisers because they did not render their version with eclipse, the same as Moffatt, charging them with dishonesty because they did not so render it, because the Greek word forms the basis of our Word eclipse. Going back to the AV and ARV readings which are the ones in question, and which have no real difference in meaning whatever, let us notice the passage.*RABV 92.2*

There is a variant reading of the MSS in this verse. The Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, Paris, and two later MSS read “the sun failing.” The Alexandrian, an amended Paris, Beza, and three secondary MSS read “and the sun was darkened.” What difference can there really be between the sun’s failing to shine as usual, and the sun’s being

darkened? Any thoughtful reader would surely understand the meaning to be the same. It is true that the word failing is eklipontos, from which we spell over our word eclipse, but this by no means signifies that eklipontos in the Greek always means eclipse, for it is the exception when it does. The ARV does not call it an eclipse, yet suppose it did, like Moffatt, would it not contribute all the more to the supernatural idea of darkening the sun at that time, if it can be shown by astronomy that the moon was full, and that any eclipse would, or could, not naturally occur? An eclipse of the sun is only a shadow cast upon it that modifies the brightness of its shining. The casting of darkness over the face of the sun at the very time when there was no possibility for a natural eclipse, surely argues strongly for the divine act at the crucifixion in casting a pall of darkness over the sun and over the land.*RABV 92.3*

201-XII-1 *Mark 16:9-20*. On the ascension.*RABV 93.1*

On this passage of Scripture dealing with the ascension, the wording throughout is essentially the same in both AV and ARV, but the author objects to the following note printed in the margin of ARV: "The two oldest Greek MSS and some other authorities, omit from *verse 9* to the end. Some other authorities have a different ending to the gospel." With what sense of justice can the author indict the Revisers "as exercising an extreme and unwarrantable license" for telling the simple, historical truth about this passage from the viewpoint of the MSS, while at the same time retaining the entire passage in the text? Would he have them cover up the truth, or is it more fair to the Bible student to know the truth concerning this passage?*RABV 93.2*

Let it be noted first of all that only *verse 19* of the extended passage under consideration here, deals with the ascension, and that in the briefest way it is recorded anywhere in the Gospels or in the Acts. Luke gives two verses to the account, telling all that Mark does, and more. In *Acts 1:9-11* is given a still fuller account from MS that is without any variance, and therefore unquestioned. This is ample authority for the ascension, if Mark said nothing about it. The author charges Doctor Hort, whom he calls "the evil genius of the Revision Committee," with the responsibility for questioning the last twelve verses of Mark's Gospel. But it is a fact that in Westcott and Hort's

own Greek Testament they include *verses 9-20* along with the rest of the chapter without any question in a footnote or elsewhere. The passage is not included in their list of rejected readings nor in their list of suspected readings in the latter part of their Greek Testament. Even if anyone were disposed to question the genuineness of the passage, there is other ample authentic record on the genuineness of the ascension.*RABV 93.3*

201-XII-1a *Matthew 6:13*. On the Lord's Prayer.*RABV 94.1*

See 93-VR*ABV 94.2*

202-XII-1b *Matthew 17:21*. On fasting.*RABV 94.3*

The author objects to the omission of this verse in the ARV text. Though *verse 21* is omitted in ARV, the marginal note says, "Many authorities, some ancient, insert *verse 21*, 'but this kind goeth not out save by prayer and fasting.' See *Mark 9:29*." The marginal note on *Mark 9:29* says "Many ancient authorities add 'and fasting.'" *1 Corinthians 7:5* omits "and fasting," with no marginal note. An examination of the MSS shows that ten of them, including all the major ones, omit the word "fasting" here, while only three secondary ones retain it. That should the translator do in such a case? Moreover, ARV retains the word "fasting" in many other scriptures where there is no variation in the MSS, such as *Matthew 6:17; 9:15; Mark 2:20, Luke 5:35; Acts 13:2, 3; 14:23; et cetera*, giving ample evidence of the genuineness of fasting as a Scriptural doctrine.*RABV 94.4*

202-XII-1c *John 8:1-11*. On the woman taken in adultery.*RABV 94.5*

It is not exactly true, as the author states, that ARV "sets off to one side" this passage, for it is retained in full in the text, though enclosed with brackets. The marginal note reads: "Most of the ancient authorities omit *John 7:53 to 8:11*. Those which contain it vary much from each other." Among the MSS omitting the passage are 13 besides Sinaiticus and Vaticanus. Those retaining it are Beza and five secondary MSS. Placing these facts before the Bible student, is dealing with them fairly. Westcott and Hort in their Greek Testament place this passage in the list of both suspected and rejected readings, on the basis of the facts just given above.

Scholars must deal with facts as they find them in the best evidence available.*RABV 94.6*

202-XII-1d *Luke 9:55, 56*. On another abbreviation.*RABV 95.1*

The author objects to the shortening of this passage in ARV, but on *verse 55*, ARV has the following marginal note, “Some ancient authorities add ‘and said, ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of.’ Some, but fewer add also ‘for the Son of Man came not to destroy men’s lives but to save’ them. Compare *chapter 19:10; John 3:17; 12:47*.” In the Scripture references given in the footnote, essentially the same statements are found as are omitted in *Luke 9:55* for lack of textual evidence. Again this is fair dealing, but said by the author to be mutilating the Scripture.*RABV 95.2*

202-XII-1e *Acts 8:37*. On Philip and the eunuch.*RABV 95.3*

The author objects also to the omission of this verse in ARV and ERV. In ARV reference is given at the end of *verse 36* to a marginal note reading, “Some ancient authorities insert, wholly or in part, *verse 37*, ‘and Philip said, If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.’” This verse is omitted in 6 other MSS besides Sinaiticus and Vaticanus. It is included in Beza in part, and in four secondary MSS. On this particular verse Scrivener says *RABV 95.4*

[Review Sec. III, Ch. 11, P. 19]*RABV 95.5*

“We cannot safely question the spuriousness of this verse, which all the critic editors condemn, and which seems to have been received from the margin, where the formula ‘I believe, etc.’ had been placed, extracted from some church ordinal.”—“Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament,” Vol. II, p.369. See also first extract from Scrivener in the next paragraph.*RABV 96.1*

202-XII-1f *1 John 5:7*. On the trinity.*RABV 96.2*

In a quotation from the Catholic Dublin Review, on page 203 of the book, the following sentence appears: “The Heavenly Witnesses have departed, and no marginal note mourns their loss.” This has reference to the fact that in the ARV *1 John 5:7* is omitted. The

following two extracts from Scrivener, recognized by the author as a scholarly critic, explain this omission:*RABV 96.3*

“A shorter passage or mere clause, whether inserted or not in our printed books, may have appeared originally in the form of a marginal note, and from the margin have crept into the text, through the wrong judgment or mere oversight of the scribe. Such we have reason to think is the history of *1 John 5:7*, the verse relating to the Three Heavenly Witnesses, once so earnestly maintained, but now generally given up as spurious. Thus too *Acts 8:37* may have been derived from some Church Ordinal.”—“A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament,” Frederick Henry Ambrose Scrivener, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D., Vol. I, p. 8.*RABV 96.4*

“It (Codex Montfortianus) contains the whole New Testament, apparently the work of three or four successive scribes, paper leaves, only one of them—that on which *1 John 5:7* stands—being glazed, as if to protect it from harm. This manuscript was first heard of between the publication of Erasmus’ second (1519) and third (1522) editions of his N. T., and after he had publicly declared, in answer to objectors, that if any Greek manuscript could be found containing the passage, he would insert it in his revision of the text; a promise which he fulfilled in 1522.”—“A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament,” Frederick Henry Ambrose Scrivener, pp. 199, 200, Vol. II.*RABV 96.5*

[Review Sec. III, Ch. 11, p. 20]*RABV 96.6*

202-XII-1g *Ephesians 5:30*. On His flesh and His bones.*RABV 97.1*

In this verse ARV stops at the word body, while AV adds “and His flesh and His bones.” Here the author exclaims: “Behold how greatly this verse is cut down in the Revised!” One wonders how this affects the meaning, since the body surely includes the flesh and the bones. The three most ancient MSS make the omission, and two later ones retain it. But is the point vital? Is any doctrine affected?*RABV 97.2*

203-XII-1h2 *Timothy 4:1*. On the time of the judgment obliterated.*RABV 97.3*

See 97-XV *RABV* 97.4

203-XII-1i *Revelation 3:10*. On captivity. *RABV* 97.5

In this passage ARV reads “for captivity” where AV reads “Leadeth into captivity.” While ARV prefers the reading of the text as better supported in the MSS, it gives the following alternative reading in the margin, “Or, leadeth into captivity.” *RABV* 97.6

CHAPTER XII “Blow after Blow in Favor of Rome”

204—I—1 *RABV 98.1*

John 1:3, 4. On creation. RABV 98.2

In this passage AV reads: “Without Him was not anything made that was made. In Him was life; and the life was the light of men.” ARV reads: “Without Him was not anything made that hath been made. In Him was life; and the life was the light of men.” There is no change here in the reading of the text, except that of altering the tense form “was made” to the more accurate “hath been made.” In the margin of ARV, however, is the following alternative reading: “Or, was not anything made. That which hath been made was life in him;” etc. *RABV 98.3*

Here again the author has placed the marginal reading in the text, and made the comment, “Let it be remembered that the marginal readings were considered of great importance by the Revisers,” whereas he should have said that the marginal readings are considered of secondary importance by the Revisers as a whole. We feel equally with the author and Dean Burgon that the marginal reading is rather unjustifiable, and are glad that it occupies only a marginal place of secondary importance, leaving the text to read exactly as it is in AV, with a little change in tense that is more accurate. It is interesting to note that the marginal arrangement is not found in either Sinaiticus or Vaticanus, but only in Alexandrinus and a few secondary MSS. Surely that Gnostic influence, as often charged by the author, did not affect the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus MSS in this instance, even though in one place he calls Eusebius “the author of the Vaticanus”! (See page 22.) *RABV 98.4*

206—II—1 *RABV 98.5*

1 Corinthians 11:29. On the sacraments. RABV 98.6

In this passage on the sacraments the author criticises the omission in ARV of the two words unworthily and Lord, but if he had looked at verse 27 preceding, he would have seen that it deals with exactly the same thing and contains both words omitted in *verse 29*. Why then is it necessary to repeat them in *verse 29*? How could their

omission condemn Protestants, as the author declares, when they are both included in *verse 27*? Moreover, four major MSS and several secondary ones omit both words in *verse 29*, while including them in *verse 27*. *RABV 98.7*

206—III-1 *RABV 99.1*

James 5:16. On faults and sins. *RABV 99.2*

The difference in the reading of this verse is the change from the word faults in AV to the word sins in ARV. The author makes the serious charge that in order to make the change from faults to sins, the Greek was changed, whereas the truth is that the testimony of the best MSS requires the change from faults to sins. But let us suppose that the original word in the Received Text were retained, and see whether it is justifiable to translate it sins instead of faults. The word is *paraptoma*. It is used in *Matthew 6:14, 15; 18:35, Mark 11:25, 26*, where forgiveness of a brother is enjoined. It is also used 6 times in *Romans 5* as the equivalent of sin. In *Ephesians 1:7; 2:5; Colossians 2:13*, this word is actually rendered sin in AV. In *Hebrews 6:6* it is used for apostasy and unpardonable sin—surely a strong type of sin. This passage exhorts us to confess our sins “one to another,” just as we pray in the Lord’s Prayer, “forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors,” and as is said in *Matthew 6:14*, following the formal prayer, “If ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. “While confession by a brother to us is not necessary to our forgiving him, yet what can be forgiven one to another can be confessed one to another. What bearing does the interpretation of the Catholic Dublin Review have on the translation of this word as sins rather than faults? It is noticeable that in their quoting the ARV on this verse they omit “one to another,” and by omitting that, presume strangely to have found some basis for the Confessional, which requires that all confess to one—the priest. Why bring in such evidence? What is said here on *paraptoma* is to show that even if the best Greek MSS did not contain *hamartia*, sin, still rendering the word *paraptoma* as sin in English is no more than is done in other scriptures, and is true to the original word itself. *RABV 99.3*

207—IV—1 *RABV 100.1*

Hebrews 10:21. On the priesthood.RABV 100.2

Criticism is made here of the use of the phrase great priest by ARV instead of high priest by AV, and the statement is made that this change in the Revised “leaves the conclusion possible that this change provided a priest for the Confessional.” Let us look at the reading itself.*RABV 100.3*

Undoubtedly the writer of the Hebrews was quoting *Zechariah 6:11* in *verse 21*, as he so frequently quotes from the Old Testament throughout the book. In the passage in Zechariah, great is the literal epithet used in both the original Hebrew and in the Septuagint, as applied to priest. All MSS agree on the original Greek word *megan* in *Hebrews 10:21. John 19:31* uses the same word in describing the Sabbath day as “an high day,” as it is rendered in both AV and ARV, in harmony with the Anglican usage of applying high to certain days and feasts. Moreover, the Greek word *megale* (a different gender of *megan*) is the regular word used today by the Greek Orthodox Church in describing Good Friday, and the entire week in which it occurs. Presumably the reason ARV did not translate great as high in *Hebrews 10:21* is because nowhere else in the New Testament is the high priest designated in this way, but rather by the epithet arch, meaning chief. We may presume also that the writer of Hebrews would have used the regular word in this verse if he had not been quoting from the Old Testament, where the Septuagint uses *megan*. Moreover, the whole theme of *chapter 10* and the preceding chapters is Christ, our High Priest, and who could possibly doubt that He is meant in this capacity in *verse 21*? Nevertheless in fidelity to the original, ARV renders *megan* with the word great.*RABV 100.4*

What bearing has the personal view of Doctor Hort, whom the author calls “one dominating Reviser,” that an earthly priesthood is a necessity, if the translators have been true to the original in their rendering?*RABV 100.5*

207—V—1*RABV 100.6*

Acts 15:23. On clergy and laity.—Sec 94—VII.RABV 101.1

208—VI—1*RABV 101.2*

*Hebrews 9:27. On the judgment.*RABV 101.3

In this passage ARV reads “after this cometh judgment,” whereas the AV reads “after this the judgment.” The author’s criticism is on the omission of the word the as opening the way for the erroneous view of Canon Farrar that judgment comes at death, but that the judgment may not come for centuries. But what does Canon Farrar’s claims have to do with the translation of a phrase that follows the original text with fidelity? All original MSS omit the word the before judgment. What should the translator do under these conditions—supply the the? It is true that ARV supplies the word cometh to ease the reading, but plainly marks it in italic as supplied. Moreover, *verses 27 and 28* together make it very plain what judgment is intended, since the second coming of Christ follows the judgment, which prepares the way for His coming.*RABV 101.4*

209—VII—1*RABV 101.5*

*John 14:2. On mansions. Author’s Title: “The Larger Hope—Another Chance After Death.”*RABV 101.6

Once more the author places the marginal reading in the text, and criticises the text as if there were no other reading. The ARV text reads many mansions, exactly the same as AV, but the author criticises the literal phrase abiding places in the margin. He then quotes a Unitarian minister and another theologian, who believes in probation after this life, in a way to show how dangerous it is to give the literal meaning of a Greek word in the margin of a text. But let us look at the text itself. The Greek word is monai, being the plural of mone, which is the noun corresponding to the verb meno, meaning to remain, stay, abide, which in turn corresponds to the Latin word maneo, meaning the same, and forming the base of the word mansion. It is recorded that AV borrowed this word from the Vulgate, one of the texts the author has often called corrupted or mutilated. True it is that the word is found in the Vulgate Version. Whether or not AV borrowed it from them does not matter if it rightly represents the original, as it is clear enough that it does as far as the etymology of the word goes. The original Greek word is used many times in the New Testament for the idea of dwelling, including the question asked our Lord, “Master, where dwellest thou” in *John*

1:38, and in *John 15* of abiding in the vine. The word *mone* is also used in *John 14:23* representing the Father and the Son as making their abode with keepers of the Word. At any rate, *verse 3* of *John 14* makes it entirely clear what Jesus meant by using the word *mansions*. The word has a wide range of meaning, from that of tarrying in a home over-night, to that of a permanent dwelling place. Who knows how permanently fixed in one place will be the mansions the Master is preparing for His people?*RABV 101.7*

210—VII—2*RABV 102.1*

Luke 1:72. On mercy to our fathers.*RABV 102.2*

Strange to say, the author criticises this text because ARV follows the exact wording of the original, while AV supplies the word *promised*, not found in any Greek MSS. He lauds the AV for putting into the text a word that is not there, and then wanders off into a digression on limbo and purgatory. Let us look at the text. The word *promised* is supplied in AV, and it is so indicated. Taking that out we have left exactly what ARV says, save the substitution of *show* for *perform*. All original MSS agree on this text without the word *promised* in it. What can the translator do but translate what is in the text? Moreover, the text literally reads “do mercy with our fathers,” which can easily be understood as performing the mercy covenanted with our fathers. Why all the talk about limbo and purgatory?*RABV 102.3*

212—VII—3*RABV 102.4*

1 Peter 4:6. On the dead.*RABV 102.5*

The criticism here is the substitution of the literal word *dead* in ARV for the longer rendering “them that are dead” in AV. Surely the author wrests this scripture to get out of it what he says he does, with the help of parentheses. All MSS agree in the wording of this text. The text reads literally: “for unto this end also to the dead was the gospel preached.” It follows a verse in which it is said that we shall give account to him that is ready to judge the living and the dead, adding by way of explanation that the gospel was preached to the dead also as well as the living. The word *dead* in this verse is *nekrois*. Just the naked word, without even the article or any verb

accompanying it. AV renders it “them that are dead,” a rather extensive rendering for a single word. ARV renders it simply “the dead,” which is the nearest to the original our idiom allows. How the author perceives any distinction between “them that are dead” and simply “the dead” is hard to see, for the supplied word “now” which he places before the word “dead” does not appear in either AV or ARV.*RABV 102.6*

212—VII—4*RABV 103.1*

Job 26:5. On the shades.RABV 103.2

The AV reads, “Dead things are formed from under the waters, and the inhabitants thereof.” The ARV reads, “They that are deceased tremble beneath the waters, and the inhabitants thereof,” with the literal the shades in the margin referring to they of the text. The author’s criticism is on the use of the literal word shades in the margin, and declares that “it is very evident here that the Revisers did not have a Protestant mentality.” But it would seem to require something more than a “Protestant mentality” to get very much out of the AV rendering, while ARV does use language that is at least intelligible. Even the Septuagint rendering makes some sense: “Shall not giants be sought for destruction under the waters, and their neighbors also? Naked is hell before him,” etc. The technical difference between the two verses lies in the use of dead things by AV and the use of they that are deceased in the ARV, with the literal the shades in the margin. The Hebrew word used here means literally shades. It is used also for dead in *Psalms 88:10*, *Proverbs 21:16*, *Isaiah 26:19*, and elsewhere. Is it wrong for the Revisers to put the literal in the margin, while putting in the text the expression “they that are deceased,” which certainly means the dead? What bearing has the comment of someone, even a Reviser, on “God’s control over departed spirits?”*RABV 103.3*

212—VII—5*RABV 104.1*

2 Peter 2:9. On punishment.RABV 104.2

The latter part of this reads in AV “to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished.” In ARV it reads “to keep the unrighteous under punishment unto the day of judgment.” The

author has found here a real cause for just criticism of the ARV translation, although he does make a rather singular statement that “The Revisers have gone even beyond the Douay Version” to get their rendering. The passage needs close examination.*RABV 104.3*

All MSS agree on the wording of this text. The discussion turns on the phrase “to be punished” in AV, and the phrase “under punishment” in ARV. It should be stated first that the Greek word *kolazomenous* “which is the basis of the two phrases just quoted, has the literal meaning to restrain, curb, hold, detain. It is easy to see how two interpretations of the word might be made, according to the setting in which it is used. One of these would be simply to hold or detain for some future purpose. The other would be to hold under restraint, as in prison, as an act of punishment. Whether the word should be rendered “held in restraint for some future purpose” or “held in restraint as a punishment,” must be determined by the context. The word is used only four times in the New Testament, first in *Matthew 25:46*, where it is rendered punishment in both AV and ARV, but where other scriptures plainly teach us that the meaning is “everlasting detention,” or everlasting “effects of punishment.” The next place is *Acts 4:21*, where again it is rendered punishment in both AV and ARV, but where the idea of further detaining them for trial or punishment lies close to the surface. Another scripture is *1 John 4:18*, where AV has torment, and ARV punishment, but where the Apostle John evidently means suffering caused by fear in the heart. The fourth scripture is the one under consideration, where the question lies between the idea of detention, or reserving, for the purpose of future judging and punishment, and the act of punishment itself. Taking the whole verse under consideration, it is easy to see that a contrast is drawn between the deliverance of the godly, and the keeping of the unrighteous in bonds, under restraint. The contrast is not between the rewarding of the godly and the punishment of the wicked. More than that, it is utterly inconsistent to charge the Lord with knowing how to keep men under punishment before they are judged!*RABV 104.4*

For these reasons we believe that ARV is absolutely wrong in the rendering of this verse, and that AV conveys the correct meaning. In this instance, we agree that the author is right in his contention

that the theological view of the Revisers on punishment of the wicked influenced their translation here. We cannot interpret the passage correctly ourselves without a proper understanding of scripture teaching on the judgment and the punishment of the wicked. Our translation of the verse could be said to be influenced by Seventh-day Adventist theology, and properly so. Yet in conceding all this, we concede no more than is true of AV in numerous instances, of which *Matthew 25:46* is only one.*RABV 105.1*

213—VIII—1*RABV 105.2*

Revelation 13:8. On names in the book of life. Author's Title: "The Different Regions of the Conscious Dead, as Roman Catholics Teach, Supported by the Revised."*RABV 105.3*

The criticism here is based on the shifting of a phrase. The latter part of the phrase reads in AV "whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." In ARV it reads "every one whose name hath not been written from the foundation of the world in the book of life of the Lamb that hath been slain." Here again the author has found a just basis for criticism, though we cannot concede the reason he implies why the Revisers render the passage as they did, namely, to side with the Jesuits. This passage too needs careful examination.*RABV 105.4*

There is no variance in the reading of this passage. The AV follows closely the Greek order from the word whose onward, which reads literally as follows: "Of whom hath not been written the name of him in the book of the life of the Lamb the slain from foundation of world." By a Greek idiom the modifier of Lamb is emphasized by repeating the article the before the modifier slain, and placing both after the word Lamb, which also favors the modifier of slain being placed immediately after it in the words "from foundation of world." These considerations remove every doubt that the phrase "from the foundation of the world" is a modifier of slain, and not written, which latter comes far back at the beginning of the relative clause, as is seen in the literal rendering above. In the marginal note, ARV gives the following alternative reading to what it has put in the text: "written in the book... slain from the foundation of the world." This

reading is exactly that of the AV, and is beyond question the correct translation. Connecting the phrase “from the foundation of the world” with the word “written,” as is done in the text, constitutes another outstanding example of where ARV has surely erred from fidelity to the Greek text, and for any known reason is inexcusable.*RABV 105.5*

213—IX—1*RABV 106.1*

Revelation 13:18. On the number of the beast.*RABV 106.2*

Once more the author substitutes in the ARV text a reading from the marginal note, making the latter read, “And his number is six hundred and sixteen,” instead of “And his number is six hundred and sixty and six,” as the ARV text actually does read. The marginal note in ARV is not an alternative reading, but simply a note of information that “Some ancient authorities read six hundred and sixteen.” The author exclaims, “Behold the uncertainty and confusion brought into the interpretation of this prophecy by offering in the margin the substitute number, 616. Did not the Revisers by this change strike a blow in favor of Rome?” He then quotes a long caustic criticism by Dean Burgon, in which the facts are doubtless correctly stated and acceptable. On the whole, however, we need not be disturbed by the harmless marginal note, since if one would look into the evidence for the Greek reading of the text with the number 666, he would find that all the major MSS, and the principal secondary ones, including Westcott and Hort, justify the reading 666, while the only sources for the number 616, as correctly stated by Dean Burgon, are only one corrupt Uncial (C.), only one Cursive copy (11), and only one Father (Tichonius), and not one ancient version.*RABV 106.3*

215—X—1*RABV 106.4*

Matthew 2:15. On being called out of Egypt. Author’s Title: “The Entire Meaning Touching Old Testament Prophecies Changed.”*RABV 106.5*

There is no question on the textual reading here, but only the translation of it, and the verb call in particular. AV reads “Out of Egypt have I called my son,” while the ARV reads “Out of Egypt did

I call my son.”*RABV 107.1*

This verb call is in the aorist form. According to standard Greek usage, this tense form, when used in a finite verb, is employed to denote the simple occurrence of an act in past time, without indicating whether the act itself was instantaneous, progressive, or in a completed state. Its effect is to lay emphasis on the fact or occurrence of the act, rather than on the nature of the act. In harmony with this standard usage, ARV has rendered the verb “did call,” which is our emphatic form in English, rather than as the AV has it “have called,” which is our form to denote a completed state of the action. The passage in *Hosea 11:1*, quoted in *Matthew 2:13*, if one can judge by its context, was used historically in regard to calling Israel out of Egypt, but like many historical statements in the Old Testament, had also a prophetic significance which is recognized by Matthew’s quoting it as fulfilled in the flight of Joseph and Mary to Egypt with the child Jesus, and their returning again to Nazareth. It is interesting to note that the Septuagint renders the verb call in *Hosea 11:1*, in the aorist form, exactly as the original Greek in *Matthew 2:15* does in quoting it. If a Greek writer could understand its prophetic application through the use of the aorist, and also record his application of it in the aorist form, what question is there in our understanding the prophetic use of “did call” in the more accurate rendering of the ARV? The incident recorded is historical in both Hosea and Matthew, for both the events recited had already taken place. It was also prophetic in both Hosea and Matthew because when uttered by Hosea, it looked forward to the incident in the life of Jesus, while Matthew looked back to the same incident, and recorded it as a fulfillment of prophecy. Dean Farrar’s comment on this text is to the point, namely, that by observing the tenses of the original, we may gain added light in the study of the Scriptures. As Dean Farrar says, this one change of verb form to represent the Greek aorist conception accounts for hundreds, and he right have said thousands, of the 56,000 changes the author has reckoned up as made in the AV, giving the impression that the changes have been more extensive and revolutionary than they are.*RABV 107.2*

It can be truthfully stated that if no more change of doctrine has been effected among these thousands of changes than is the case

in *Matthew 2:15*, there is little to fear. *Matthew 2:15* rather confirms our doctrine of interpreting prophecy, as any other instance of fidelity to the true reading of the original will do.*RABV 108.1*

216—XI—1*RABV 108.2*

1 Corinthians 15:3, 4. On the charge of tense in the verb. Author's Title: "Entire Meaning of Great Crises in Christian Life Changed."*RABV 108.3*

In this passage on the resurrection the author says that he arose has been changed to he hath been raised, for a definite purpose, and proceeds to lay a charge against the Revision Committee of "deliberately making changes in order to introduce a new set of doctrines." The one definite reason for changing he arose to he hath been raised is the simple fact that the Greek verb is in the present perfect passive form, and requires our English present perfect passive form to express it. How much more emphatic it was for Paul in this great chapter on the resurrection to emphasize the raising of Christ from the dead in the verb form that denotes the great act as fully accomplished, and its effect as extending to the time he was writing, and passing on to us a form that also remains true in all its glorious effect to the present hour, and will so continue to the hour of His coming. Here is a plain example of the additional light that Dean Farrar says we get by observing carefully the verb forms in the original. The simple form, he arose, merely designates the act as occurring, but does not imply in any sense the completed or continued state of that act in the effects of it that we enjoy today. In many connections the simple form is all the writer would desire to use, but where the special theme is the resurrection, as in *1 Corinthians 15*, Paul uses the more meaningful form, and it is a strong help to us to bring out the full force of the verb form he employed. Paul further shows a fine sense of discrimination in the use of tense forms in the same chapter, by employing the aorist exclusively in *verses 6 to 8*, while using the perfect again in *verse 12*, then coming back to the aorist in *verses 15 and 16*.*RABV 108.4*

How can the author in all reason call the translation purely arbitrary when it follows the original faithfully? His quarrel should be with Paul and not with the translator. His claims at the bottom of page

219 regarding the use of the tenses, seem utter folly in the light of the original forms used in the text.*RABV 109.1*

220—XI—2*RABV 109.2*

Matthew 27:46. Again on the tense form.*RABV 109.3*

In this passage AV reads “My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?” ARV reads exactly the same word for word, but puts the following alternative reading in the margin “Or, why did’st Thou forsake me?” The author has placed the marginal reading in the text and then criticises the substituting of the literal aorist form of the verb for the free and loose rendering in AV by the perfect tense. But the author’s comments go far afield from the text. There is no mention of death in the passage, but only a forsaking. Does the author want it to appear that the apparent forsaking of Christ by the Father at the time of His agony should be “supreme” and “continuous” in effect? This is almost, if not altogether, implied in the AV use of the perfect tense form. At any rate the author has again brought in the marginal reading to serve as a basis for his criticism, and then does not discuss the idea of forsaking at all, but goes off on another tirade on revision changes in general, and theological views concerning them.*RABV 109.4*

22—XII—1*RABV 109.5*

1 Corinthians 11:24. On the sacraments. Author’s Title “The Jesuitical Doctrine of the Sacraments Favored by the Revised.”*RABV 109.6*

In this passage on the sacraments the words take, eat, and broken, which are found in the AV are omitted in the Revised. That this omission is not a*RABV 109.7*

[Review Section III, Chap.12—15]deliberate attempt of the translators to mutilate a passage, but rather to render it in fidelity to the Greek text is clear enough when we take the facts into consideration.*RABV 109.8*

The two words take and eat omitted in this passage, are both included in the ARV text in *Matthew 26:26*. In the Corinthian

passage they are not found in any principal MS except the Received Text. Luke also omits these two words in his record of the supper in *chapter 22:19*, as is easily seen in both AV and ARV. The word broken is omitted also in Matthew, Mark, and Luke in AV. This makes it clear that broken is not used in any of the Gospels, and in the Corinthian passage it is found only in later amended editions of the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, Paris, and Beza MSS, and in a few secondary ones.*RABV 110.1*

But in the face of these facts, the author makes an attack on the “Cambridge trio of Revisers,” and on what he calls their central doctrine, “the Person of Christ”, using several pages in an attempt to discredit this doctrine, closing with a paragraph that is noticed in the latter part of the following summary.*RABV 110.2*

Summary on Scriptures Examined

In summarizing this examination of Scripture passages, let it be said that it has not been the purpose of this review to make a defense of the American or English Revised Version as such, nor to compare in any systematic way its value and reliability as compared with the Authorized Version. That would be a separate, and withal a profitable task in itself.*RABV 111.1*

The purpose of this review has been to determine by an impartial examination of the facts bearing on the actual reading of the Versions, whether or not the author's contention can be sustained that the Revised Versions are manipulated, mutilated, theologically—biased translations and therefore unreliable and unsafe for our use.*RABV 111.2*

It is only fair to both author and reader to leave our own conclusion on the matter to follow a summarizing of our findings in the examination of the proof texts brought forward by the author.*RABV 111.3*

Any one who reads through with an unbiased mind Chapters VI, XI, and XII of this book will readily discern the following facts:*RABV 111.4*

1. That in the title of Chapter VI, the author begs the question by assuming that whenever the same or similar reading occurs in ARV as is found in Douay, therefore ARV obtained it from Douay; in other words, that a Douay reading? in ARV by design, and this in spite of the fact that no Catholic sat on the Revision Committee, and that ARV is a revision of the AV by a large body of Protestant scholars in the light of the best Greek MSS, not in the light of Douay.*RABV 111.5*

2. That in his opening remarks in Chapter VI, the author allows no correction, improvement, or revision of the Greek text in the light of the older, more complete, and better attested MSS, and many more in number, that have come to light and been critically studied by a large number of expert scholars since the one man Erasmus made up his hasty text from a few MSS under pressure of competition

with another printer than his employer, but which the author calls “a pure Greek text.”*RABV 111.6*

3. That because a considerable number of individually translated versions “all in the main agree with the change of thought in the Revised,” both these and the Revised “were the products of a common influence.” The influence plainly meant by the author is one outside the Bible and the MSS, namely, the Jesuit Influence; whereas, one would logically conclude that the influence bringing so uniform a result from scholars widely scattered and working individually, was that of a text so well perfected by devout scholars in the work of generations that little room for essential divergence was found by the translator. It surely does not make our Bible Catholic to say the same thing a Catholic version says if the Catholic version says the same thing the best attested MSS say.*RABV 112.1*

4. That summing up the examination of all the texts brought forward by the author to prove the laterad contention of the entire book, namely, that the product of the Revisers is a manipulated, mutilated, corrupted, Romanized, modernized, unreliable version of the Holy Scriptures, and that the changes in reading seriously affect fundamental doctrines of the gospel as we understand and teach them, and constitute “blow after blow against the truth” and “blow after blow in favor of Rome,” we find the following results:*RABV 113.1*

Out of 17 Scripture passages reviewed in Chapter VI to show that “the Jesuit Bible reappears in the ARV,” only 9 in the most liberal allowance can be said to touch doctrine at all. Out of these 9 passages, 8 do not mis-state any doctrine, and wherein they can be made to appear by omission of a word or phrase to stop short of expressing some added detail of doctrine, that same detail is expressed numerous times in other scriptures of the same version. In the one remaining instance of the 9, the author mis-states the doctrine on the time of the judgment when he criticises the change from the rendering of the AV where the latter mis-states it. See page 97.*RABV 113.2*

In every one of the remaining 8 of the 17 passages examined, the

point omitted in 4 instances is fully expressed or made clear in parallel passages, in 2 instances in the context, and in 2 instances in the margin, and in some instance in two or all three of these ways,—all in the same version.*RABV 113.3*

5. That in the opening remarks of the author in Chapter XI, he allows no motive for placing alternative readings in the margin except “to sow, broadcast, doubts about the sacred utterances,” whereas seven of the very passages he brings forth for examination give in the margin the exact reading of the AV. If these AV readings “cast doubt on the sacred utterances” it is a pity they are found in its own text, and a good thing they have only a secondary place in the margin of ARV. In five other passages cited, the marginal reading simply gives the literal rendering of a textual reading exactly like the AV.*RABV 113.4*

6. That, again, the author allows no motive to the painstaking care to be exact that is obvious in his quotation from the Chairman of the English Revision Committee, but a “settled purpose... that doctrine should be changed,”—and of course in harmony with the Chairman’s theological views! Had not such painstaking care been taken to be true to the original, we should still have some of the obvious errors in AV to deal with.*RABV 114.1*

7. That summing up the examination of all the 31 scriptures brought forward by the author in Chapter XI to illustrate “blow after blow against the truth,” we find the following results:*RABV 114.2*

(a) Only one blow that can really be said to be “against the truth,” and that one not contrary to truth but stating only part of the truth, namely, the rendering of *2 Timothy 3:16*, “Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable” rather than “all scripture is inspired of God and is profitable,” the meaning turning on where the *is*, not expressed in the original, is placed. The latter rendering by AV is given in the margin as an alternative reading.*RABV 114.3*

(b) Three of the blows cited are positively blows for the truth, namely, the more accurate rendering of *John 5:39*; *Acts 3:19*; *2 Timothy 4:1*, thus correcting obvious errors in AV, involving no change whatever in the Greek text except the single instance in Timothy of substituting the better attested *kai*, and, for *kata*, *at*, thus

relieving the text of an error on the time of the judgment.*RABV 114.4*

(c) Eight of the blows involve only change from a more free to a more literal rendering, and therefore instead of being “against the truth,” are for greater accuracy in expressing the truth, such as age for world, sign for miracle, turn for convert, a noun for an adjective—all equally employed in other scriptures in AV.*RABV 114.5*

(d) Nine of the so-called blows might appear on first thought to affect the truth in the particular passage, but on second thought and investigation are fully compensated for in the context or in parallel passages in the same ARV, and therefore, such omission or change in the particular verse is not at all vital to understanding the truth.*RABV 115.1*

(e) Ten other so-called blows are purely matters of fidelity to the original reading in the particular passage, but in five instances giving the old reading in the margin, in two instances giving the old reading in the text with a marginal note indicating its textual status, and in three instances a modification of the text with no marginal note, but in not one of these affecting in any way the interpretation of the passage in the light of other scriptures in ARV where the textual authority is not in question.*RABV 115.2*

8. That in his opening remarks in Chapter XII, the author does not allow fidelity to authenticated Greek texts to govern any changes made in the passages of scripture he brings forward, but charges that these passages “the Revisers have changed to those Catholic readings which favor the doctrines of Rome,” clearly implying that this was the motive that prompted the changes.*RABV 115.3*

9. That by quoting a Catholic bishop’s fair statement of why one passage in the Revision does not differ materially from the Catholic version, the author again falls into the fallacy of concluding that because a Revised passage agrees substantially in wording with the Catholic version of the same, therefore the Revisers made the change from the AV to “favor the doctrines of Rome,” not because, as the Catholic Bishop states fairly, the translations were made from “substantially identical copies of the same document.”*RABV 115.4*

10. That, summing up examination of the 17 passages of scripture brought forward in Chapter XII as examples of “blows in favor of Rome,” we find the following results:*RABV 115.5*

(a) Only one change can really be said to “favor the doctrines of Rome,” but no more so than the generally accepted doctrine of Protestants on the same point, namely, that the punishment of the wicked is now going on somewhere, as the ARV rendering of 2 *Peter 2:9* indicates—a rendering which can be shown to be absolutely wrong in the interpretation of a single Greek word with no variant reading in the MSS. If, however, the Revisers had any ulterior motive in rendering the word “under punishment,” they did not have to go to Rome to find the doctrine, and the author himself credits them with having “gone beyond even the Douay Version” to find their motive!*RABV 116.1*

(b) One other instance in which the Revisers came nearest to violating fidelity to the Greek text, is that in *Revelation 13:8*, in which the final phrase “from the foundation of the world” is taken far out of its normal grammatical setting back to the word “written” at almost the beginning of this long relative clause. The only reason one can think of why it was done, was the apparent incongruity with fact of making the Lamb appear literally slain from the foundation of the world, yet it is difficult indeed to see how this rendering struck any more of a blow in favor of Rome than any other body of religionists.*RABV 116.2*

(c) Of the other fifteen scriptures cited, five give the AV reading in the text, with a literal or alternative reading in the margin; in three the point in question is made clear in the context or a parallel scripture in the same version, and seven are rendered in fidelity to authenticated Greek texts without marginal note, two of these being only a change in tense form—all these fifteen without changing any doctrine if examined without bias.*RABV 116.3*

Systematic Depravation.—At the end of Chapter XII, the author gives a sort of summary of his findings. In sweeping style, so characteristic of his book, he declares:*RABV 116.4*

1. That in the work of translation the generalship of two men—Westcott and Hort—swept along with them 23 other ripe scholars

on the Revision Committee. The ability and standing of these 23 who were so ruthlessly overruled in their decisions by two fellow members, is indicated in the fact that 21 of them had a doctor's degree, 4 of them were bishops, 4 of them deans, 1 an archbishop, 5 were presidents, principals, or masters of colleges, 2 were college professors, and 3 were canons or vicars. The two men who outgeneraled them all were a Cambridge Fellow and a Cambridge Professor, who are variously styled by the author as "dominant mentalities," "not prominently known at the time," "evil genius," "Cambridge trio of Revisers." (with Lightfoot)—albeit on another page he calls Ellicott, Lightfoot and Moulton the "triumvirate which constantly worked to bring things to a head."*RABV 117.1*

2. He declares that the "generalship" of Westcott and Hort consisted of "changing the divine Word to bear the impress of their doctrines," although there were on the committee with them 17 Doctors of Divinity and 9 high officials of the church bearing titles of Eight Reverend, Very Reverend, or Most Reverend, all of whom would naturally be expected to be experts and champions of doctrine.*RABV 117.2*

3. He declares that these two little-known Cambridge Professors "changed the Greek in 5,336 places" ("mutilations" he calls them), whereas, according to Kenyon, he should have said the still larger number of 5,778 improvements were made by the whole committee in order to correct the many glaring defects of Erasmus' hastily assembled text, so obsequiously followed by Stephens and the Elzevirs in later editions.*RABV 117.3*

4. The author reckons up 36000 of what he calls "metamorphoses of the English," whereas he should have said that 120,000 defects in the Authorized Version were "detected and noted." Here is a published statement of this fact:*RABV 117.4*

[Review Sec. III, Sum. Scripts. p. 8]*RABV 117.5*

"Concerning existing defects it may be said briefly, that the variations already detected and noted as existing in various manuscripts, versions and editions, amount to about 120,000"—"Revised New Testament and History of Revision," published by J. S Goodman & Co., Chicago, p. 54.*RABV 118.1*

5. The obvious purpose of the author in his sweeping charges on what two “little known” men could do by way of dominating a committee of 27 independent-thinking British scholars and church dignitaries, and in his flaunting two sets of figures twice in three lines for their cumulative effect, is to “stamp many of the readings of the Revised Version with the marks of systematic depravation,” as he himself states.*RABV 118.2*

These figures give the impression that the changes by way of improving the AV translation were of a radical and revolutionary nature. But what are the facts? The Revisers found 120,000 defects to be remedied. That was the nature of these defects? Here is reliable testimony:*RABV 118.3*

“But of this large number of errors it is probable that at least 90,000 are of small importance. President Chase, of the Revision Committee, recently said of these variations: ‘Ninety-nine in a hundred—nay, perhaps I may say nine thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine in ten thousand, are practically of no importance as involving any point of faith or practice. The majority of the different readings in this formidable enumeration are mere differences in spelling. Next some slight differences in grammatical form, not affecting the substantial sense; then differences in the greater or less fullness of writing the name of our Saviour;... then comes the use of synonymous expressions—(thus of the three Greek words, all meaning to say, one manuscript will use one, and another in the same passage another, and another the third); then we have a class of variations in which the effect is merely rhetorical, the same idea being expressed in different readings with greater or less force and vividness; and the whole number of texts in which the variations of reading would affect materially the doctrines conveyed can be counted by units—I had almost said upon the fingers of one hand.’—Idem.*RABV 118.4*

Where, then, can be found this loudly heralded “systematic depravation” of the Scriptures through the so-called connivance of two men, as revealed in the Revised Version itself?*RABV 118.5*

Conclusion

In concluding this section of the review, let it be borne in mind that the author's chief purpose in these three chapters is to discredit the Revised Versions by proofs from the Scriptures themselves. He essays to show that the translation is mutilated, manipulated, Romanized, Modernized, to such an extent that it constitutes a "systematic depravation" of the Scriptures, and is unreliable and unsafe for our use.*RABV 119.1*

But in the face of the foregoing examination of the Scriptures brought forward by the author to prove his contention, it does not seem possible for a reasoning and unbiased mind to draw any other conclusion than the following:*RABV 119.2*

1. The contention of the author must stand or fall on whether he proves or fails to prove by an examination of the Scriptures themselves that the Revised translation has been governed by and shows evidence of a sinister purpose so to wrest the Scriptures as to make them teach biased theological views of the translators, rather than to reveal fidelity to the best authenticated Greek texts that time and scholarly, painstaking research have brought to light in the past three centuries.*RABV 119.3*

2. Viewed in this light, and in the light of the facts presented in the examination itself, the author has utterly failed in the acid test of proving his contention by the results actually seen in the Revised translations submitted in evidence.*RABV 119.4*

General Summary

A general summary of findings in the review of this book may be given in brief as follows:*RABV 119.5*

Purpose of the book.—As indicated by the title, the purport of the book is to vindicate the Authorized Version of the Bible. Its real purpose is to discredit the Revised Versions of the Bible.*RABV 119.6*

Plan of the book.—Its plan is to trace side by side the historical, religious, and personal influences that on one hand, brought us a so-called “pure Greek text” and a “perfect” translation in the King James Version of the Bible; and on the other hand, a manipulated, mutilated Greek text and a theologically biased, unreliable translation in the English and American Revised Versions of the Bible. As the final, determining proof of his contention, the author produces some 65 parallel Scripture passages, usually from the Authorized and American or English Revised Versions, with running comment on each.*RABV 120.1*

Method of the book.—In handling his material, the author classifies it well, cites his authorities with much precision, and draws his conclusions with clearness sufficient to leave no one in doubt where he stands. Nevertheless, he employs unfair and illogical methods of weighing evidence such as these:*RABV 120.2*

1. He pre-judges his case before he tries it.*RABV 120.3*

2. He draws material from a number of authorities without any standing in textual or historical criticism.*RABV 120.4*

3. From authorities in good standing he selects only such matter as will bend to his pre-judgment of the case, often splitting paragraphs and even sentences so as to omit what would nullify his purpose in quoting if left in.*RABV 120.5*

4. He draws much from the writings of men who participated in heated and bitter controversy over Versions at the time of their issuance, and less from the calmer, more dispassionate opinion of later times.*RABV 120.6*

5. He quotes rather freely from Catholic, Unitarian, Gnostic, and Modernistic sources, to bolster up his contentions when he can find a paragraph or sentence that appears to slant his way.*RABV 121.1*

6. He draws frequently unwarranted and illogical conclusions and strained interpretations from evidence brought forward.*RABV 121.2*

7. In criticising a translation of Scripture he chooses often to ignore the Greek text, the English context, and parallel Scriptures; as also the evidence of the MSS.*RABV 121.3*

8. when it serves his purpose, he disregards an alternative reading or an informative note in the margin. But when it serves his purpose, he incorporates into the text a reading from the margin, and criticises that text as if it were the translator's preferred reading.*RABV 121.4*

9. He shows a manifest aversion to having a literal reading of the Greek appear in either margin or text if it involves any change or hint of change from the old reading.*RABV 121.5*

10. In the examination of Scripture passages, the author's guiding star is whether or not the Revised translation differs in any respect from the Authorized Version. when it does, the rendering passes under his immediate condemnation regardless of textual or other reasons for the change.*RABV 121.6*

Failures of the book.—To be more particular, the author has failed to sustain his contentions in the effort to achieve his objective in writing the book, in the following important respects:*RABV 121.7*

A. As set forth with reliable evidence in Section I of this review, he has failed—*RABV 121.8*

1. To trace down a distinct and unbroken line of MSS or texts from Apostolic times to the publication of the first Greek text of the New Testament by Erasmus, and another distinct line by way of Rome and the papists.*RABV 121.9*

2. He has failed notably to prove that the Itala of the Waldenses was any other than one of the older Latin versions originating in

Northern Africa, spreading thence into Catholic Europe, leading up to the Vulgate, and serving as a basis for the vulgate itself. This failure leaves a wide gap in the so-called Apostolic succession of manuscripts that must be added to other numerous gaps the author has failed to bridge as between Palestine, Constantinople, Waldensian Italy, Southern France, England, and Erasmus *RABV 122.1*

3. He has failed to establish the authorship of the Vaticanus as that of Eusebius or the author of the Sinaiticus as that of Origen, or that these two MSS, with their marked differences could be two of the fifty Bibles supplied to Constantine from Caesarea by Eusebius. *RABV 122.2*

4. He has failed to show any relationship between the Hexapla of Origen and the Vaticanus or Sinaiticus MSS of the New Testament, because of the fact that Origen's Hexapla contained the Old Testament only, written in Hebrew and Greek. *RABV 122.3*

5. He has failed to prove, by his method of attacking the character and theology of Revisers like Westcott, Hort, and others—the fallacy of argumentum ad hominem—that the Revised Version departs from fidelity to the best authenticated MSS in any other than a few exceptional instances—much fewer than are found in the Authorized Version. *RABV 122.4*

B. As set forth in Section II of this review, the author has failed entirely—*RABV 122.5*

1. To prove that the text of Erasmus was a “pure Greek text”; for —*RABV 123.1*

2. He failed to inform the reader that Erasmus had in hand or the building of his text only seven Greek MSS at most, and these dating not earlier than the twelfth century; that he had to borrow the MS for the book of Revelation and translate from the Catholic Vulgate six full verses and other words and phrases that were missing in this MS; that all these MSS save the one on Revelation are still in Basle, and do not appear on the lists of principal and most reliable MSS as dated and classified by scholarly textual critics up to now; that Erasmus did his work of building a Greek text in much haste over a

period of less than a year, in order to be first on the market before a competitor.*RABV 123.2*

3. The author failed utterly to prove that no Catholic influence could have been exercised over the work of Erasmus; for—*RABV 123.3*

4. He failed to inform his readers that Erasmus himself was a Catholic to the day of his death; that his personal Bible was the Catholic Vulgate, which he printed in parallel columns with the Greek in his New Testament; that he dedicated his Greek Testament to Pope Leo X, and printed this Pope's imprimatur in his second edition; and that he corrected his fourth edition in more than 100 places from Cardinal Ximenes' Complutensian text printed in Spain; and that this same fourth edition became the mother-edition to the Received Text used so largely by the King James translators.*RABV 123.4*

5. The author failed to prove that either of the two oldest MSS, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, was corrupted by the papists or that their authors were Eusebius and Origen, respectively.*RABV 123.5*

6. He fails to inform his readers that the Sinaiticus and Vaticanus MSS are listed as first and third among the major MSS by scholars up to date.*RABV 123.6*

C. As set forth by the evidence in Section III of this review, the author has failed—*RABV 124.1*

1. To show by the Scriptures cited in chapter VI that a Jesuit influence appears in the readings of the Revised Versions; for—*RABV 124.2*

2. He falls repeatedly into the fallacy of concluding that when or since a Revised reading is more like the Jesuit reading than is the AV, the Revised was therefore influenced by or copied the Jesuit reading—a fallacy that would eliminate nine-tenths of the Bible.*RABV 124.3*

3. He ignores all other reasons for change than the Jesuit influence—such as the testimony of the MSS, greater fidelity to the Greek text, and clearer, more up-to-date and intelligible words and

expressions.*RABV 124.4*

4. The author further fails to show by the conclusive test of examining the Revised text itself in the scriptures cited in Chapter XI, that the Revisers struck “blow after blow against the truth”; for—*RABV 124.5*

5. In addition to the fallacies pointed out in chapter VI above, the facts revealed in the review are—*RABV 124.6*

a. That the author allows no motive for a change in reading or a marginal note except, as he says, either “to sow, broadcast, doubts about the sacred utterances,” or “a settled purpose... that doctrine should be changed.”*RABV 124.7*

b. That of the 31 “blows” listed in chapter XI, only one can be really said to be “against the truth,” and that not contrary to truth but stating only a part of the truth—*2 Timothy 3:16*. c. That three of the blows are decidedly for the truth by way of a more accurate rendering—*John 5:39; Acts 3:19 2 Timothy 4:1*.*RABV 124.8*

d. That the other 27 changes have to do merely with more literal or accurate renderings, certain omissions for lack of textual authority but supplied in the context or parallel passages in the same version, or greater fidelity to the Greek reading of that particular text.*RABV 125.1*

6. Again, the author fails to show by the Revised readings in 17 passages examined in chapter XII, that “blow after blow in favor of Rome” has been struck by the Revisers; for—*RABV 125.2*

7. In addition to the fallacies and narrowing attitudes revealed in chapters VI and XI, these facts are obvious.*RABV 125.3*

a. That among 17 cited, only one blow can be said to be “in favor of Rome,” but no more so than in favor of fundamentally erroneous Protestant doctrine, namely, that the punishment of the wicked is now going on somewhere. See *2 Peter 2:9*, ARV.*RABV 125.4*

b. That in one other instance the Revisers failed of fidelity to the Greek text—*Revelation 13:8*—but with a result that it is difficult to

see as favoring Rome any more than other bodies of religionists.*RABV 125.5*

c. That the other 15 instances deal only with marginal readings, more literal renderings, and greater fidelity to authenticated Greek MSS.*RABV 125.6*

